

THE SOTERIOLOGY OF JESUS.

By *Kenneth Sylvan Guthrie*, Ph. D.



PHILADELPHIA :
Dunlap Printing Company,
1306-08-10 Filbert Street.

THE PROPHET PUBLISHING HOUSE,

P. O. BOX 8,

Medford, Mass.

C. 12-23, 15

✓ *

III. 10951

Theological Society
N.Y. City.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1896, by the
DUNLAP PRINTING COMPANY,
In the Office of the Librarian of Congress at Washington, D. C.

THE SOTERIOLOGY OF JESUS.

INDEX.

	<i>Page</i>
Chapter I. MORALITY AND THEOLOGY	1
1. Morality or Theology as Guides of Life	1
2. Theology	1
3. Morality	2
4. Neither Theology nor Morality Alone	2
5. Morality and Theology Inseparable	3
6. Moral Examination of Theology	3
7. Formulation	4
Chapter II. THE POLEMIC BETWEEN ABAILARD AND BERNARD	7
1. Polemic	7
2. The Theory	7
3. Objections	8
4. Abailard's Own Opinion	9
Chapter III. HUMAN RUIN ACCORDING TO AN- SELM	12
1. The Question	12
2. Original Sin Assumed	12
3. Sin as Debt	13
4. Satisfaction for Debt	13
5. Why God Chose this Means of Salvation	14
Chapter IV. NECESSITY OF SALVATION ACCORD- ING TO ANSELM	16
1. Why Need Man be Saved?	16
2. Why Cannot Angels be Saved?	16
3. How Shall Man be Saved?	17
4. Why Christ was needed	18
5. The Sinlessness of Jesus	18
6. How the Effects of Jesus' Death are Applied	19
Chapter V. LIFE AND LABORS OF PELAGIUS AND COELESTIUS	21
1. Pelagius	21
2. Coelestius	21
3. Labors of Pelagius and Coelestius	21
4. Augustine's Setting of the Facts	22
Chapter VI. FREEWILL ACCORDING TO PELAGI- US	23
1. Man's Possibilities	23
2. Man's Limitation	23
3. The Assistance of God's Grace	23

Chapter VII. ORIGINAL SIN ACCORDING TO PELAGIUS	25
1. The End of Salvation	25
2. Original Sin	26
Chapter VIII. PREDESTINATION ACCORDING TO PELAGIUS	27
1. Soteriology	27
2. Foreordination is Prescience	27
3. Redemption	27
Chapter IX. THE ETHICS OF AUGUSTINE	28
1. Freedom of the Will	28
2. The Highest Good	28
3. Evil	29
Chapter X. FREEWILL ACCORDING TO AUGUSTINE	30
1. The Freedom of the Will	30
2. Freewill is only to Sin	30
3. Grace Irresistible	30
4. Objections to Augustine's Theory	31
Chapter XI. ORIGINAL SIN ACCORDING TO AUGUSTINE	33
1. Infant Damnation	33
2. Objections	34
3. Transmission of Original Sin	35
Chapter XII. PELAGIAN OBJECTIONS TO THE ORIGINAL SIN DOCTRINE AS HELD BY AUGUSTINE	36
1. Descent of Guilt	36
2. Marriage an Increase of Damnation	36
3. Bondage to Devil	37
4. Why do the Sinless Suffer?	37
5. Necessity Destroys Merit	38
Chapter XIII. PREDESTINATION ACCORDING TO AUGUSTINE	39
1. Predestination is independent of Merit	39
2. Predestination to Damnation	39
3. Redemption	40
Chapter XIV. WHO WAS THE INNOVATOR, PELAGIUS OR AUGUSTINE?	41
1. Pelagius's and Augustine's Moral Character	41
2. Who was the Innovator?	41
3. Orthodoxy Settled by Appeal to Writings	42
4. Counciliar Decisions	42
5. Personal Contrast	42

6. The Fathers on Freewill	44
7. The Fathers on Original Sin	48
8. The Fathers on Predestination and Redemption	50
Chapter XV. THE ATONEMENT ACCORDING TO ATHANASIUS	52
1. Interdependence of Total Depravity and Vicariousness	52
2. Athanasius's View of the Atonement	52
3. Athanasius's First Theory	33
4. Athanasius's Second Theory	54
5. Athanasius's Third Theory	54
6. Limitation of Salvation	54
7. Human Depravity	54
Chapter XVI. THE SOTERIOLOGY OF ORIGEN	56
1. Origen's System	56
2. The Freedom of the Will	56
3. Human Perfectibility	56
4. Life beyond may explain Difficulties of this Life	57
5. Justice and Love are United in Jesus	57
6. Origen Held no Total Depravity	58
7. The Atonement	58
Chapter XVII. THE SOTERIOLOGY OF THE FATHERS PRIOR TO ORIGEN	59
1. The Soteriology of Clement of Alexandria	59
2. Old Testament Symbology	60
Chapter XVIII. THE SOTERIOLOGY OF THE PAULINE WRITINGS	61
1. Summary	61
2. Romans	61
3. I and II Corinthians	67
4. Galatians	69
5. Minor Epistles	70
Chapter XIX. THE SOTERIOLOGY OF THE BOOK OF ACTS	72
1. Summary	72
2. The Soteriology of Peter	72
3. The Soteriology of Philip and James	74
4. The Soteriology of Paul	74
Chapter XX. THE SOTERIOLOGY OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL	77
1. Summary	77
2. Quotations	77
Chapter XXI. THE SOTERIOLOGY OF THE THIRD GOSPEL	83
1. The Soteriology	83
2. The Christology	85

Chapter XXII. THE SOTERIOLOGY OF THE SECOND GOSPEL	86
1. The Soteriology	86
2. The Christology	87
Chapter XXIII. THE SOTERIOLOGY OF THE FIRST GOSPEL	88
1. The Soteriology	88
2. The Christology	90
Chapter XXIV. THE CHRISTIANITY OF JESUS ...	91
1. Summary	91
2. Theology and Morality	91
3. Faith	92
4. Facts, not Theories	93
5. Reconciliation	94
6. The Means of Reconciliation	94
7. Salvation	94
8. Salvation, Personal	95
9. Jesus the Theologian and Moralist	95
NOTES	96

CHAPTER I.

MORALITY AND THEOLOGY.

1. Morality or Theology as Guides of Life.—In one of his most beautiful sermons the venerable Canon Kingsley says : “ Whatsoever God forbids must be wrong. But is it wrong because God forbids it, or does God forbid it because it is wrong? For instance, suppose that God had not forbidden us to steal, would it be right then to steal, or at least, not wrong? Did God, who made all things, make right and wrong ? ” The answer to these questions is important, for on it depends wholly our conception of the Universe, and of God. It is as important as the solution of the problem whether it is the earth or the sun which moves around the other. Supposing that a thing is right merely because God wills it, then morality depends wholly on theology ; on the contrary, if God wills aught because it is right, then theology depends on morality. This is a choice of principles, morality or theology. If a selection between these two must be made, it should be only because the chosen authority is surest, and best adapted to guide the practical details of life.

Prejudice, custom, and inclination should have nothing to do with this choice. Calm investigation, accurate observation, and persistent reflection, are requisite to the realization of truth. Few indeed have the power of seeing a point when it makes against them, and if they see it, they weaken its force by refusing it consideration. Yet, sooner or later the ascendancy of morality or theology will assert itself in the life, so that it is useless for any man to avoid or procrastinate this important decision. The sooner a thinker decides which of the two measuring-rods is the surest, and best adapted to practical use, the better is it for him and all those among whom his influence extends, and the more likely is he to reach a satisfactory conclusion. In vain does the ostrich hide his head in the sand, when the enemy approaches. It were far better for him in the end to examine critically his own resources, and those of the coming foe, and to use what opportunity of defence or flight may still remain within his grasp.

In order to judge intelligently between morality and theology, they should be critically considered one at a time.

2. Theology.—Theology may lead the way.

(1). It is busied about the remote future or past of the human race, dealing but incidentally with the problems of the present.

(2). Theology is treated of in endless separate treatises and bewilderingly numerous definitions.

(3). Its best treatises are written only in a few languages, so that they are inaccessible as a rule except to those who understand those few dead languages.

(4). At best, the works treating of theology are hard to understand, and still more difficult to retain.

(5). Only the learned, or those fortunate few who have a very liberal education can hope to feel at home in its domains.

(6). It is full of very real contradictions, and hopeless critical puzzles, that cannot be solved for certain until the day of judgment.

(7). It demands, for its interpretation and perpetuation the support of an expensive and complicated order of priesthood.

(8). Theology is an artificial study inasmuch as it is not born naturally with every soul. The immense majority of humanity is made up of the poor, the heathen, children, old people, business men, and laboring men, who are utterly debarred from study of it by their several limitations.

(9). The guidance of theology is most inaccessible when most needed in the sudden emergencies of daily life, and most certain when least needed in moments of leisurely study and reflection.

3. *Morality*.—Is conscience as practical and as sure as theology?

(1). It deals always with the immediate question at issue, neglecting castiistical issues whether it be right to do ultimate good by immediate doubtful means.

(2). It is a natural gift, or part of the endowment of nature, of all races, ages and people. None is excluded from it by poverty, age or education.

(3). Its counsels are ever given in the moment of need, in the moment of action. It is ever present to guide and direct in view of even the unknown future.

(4). Its voice is clear and distinct in the midst of unnumbered temptations and doubts.

4. *Neither Morality nor Theology Alone*.—If the reader should, after following the above arguments seek to make a rash decision, and declare for morality as against theology, and should draw the conclusion that God wills a thing because it is right only, then indeed would reflection show him that the conclusion he had come to was to a certain extent unsatisfactory.

In respect to the solution of the problem which Kingsley put forth so beautifully, a philosopher would be very dissatisfied. For it would be after all pessimism, positing above the Supreme God a still higher principle, that of right—a philosophy of the unconscious. There must be some flaw therefore in the premisses which led to such a conclusion.

Looking once more at the field of theology, it is very plain that in spite of all its disadvantages, it possesses some very important sources of certitude. It keeps before the mind the great outline of human and divine interdependence, without which the moralist loses his bearings in the Universe. The moralist who knows of no theology is like the man who considers the earth the centre of the universe. The moralist who understands

theology knows this earth, but also that it is but a planet of the solar system, but a part of a great Whole. Theology teaches resignation to the Divine Will of a Father in heaven, who must be known to be loved, and a knowledge of the great facts of the salvation of the human race by application of the principles of which the conscience may be quickened. Besides, theology is a stable and perpetual witness to teach all classes of men unremittingly, without the danger of running into individualistic eccentricities.

On the other hand, morality all alone is very helpless. Discussions of ethics are proverbially barren, and at best, dependent on psychology and philosophy. Not only do the codes of ethics vary in every race, age, climate, profession and individual conscience, but much which many call right is but blind obedience to local custom, as, for instance, etiquette. Problems of conscience at times appear insoluble, and the more conscientious a man is, the more is he in danger of running into fanatical extremes.

It would then appear that neither theology nor morality alone can claim any advantage over the other. Each has advantages the other lacks, but has also disadvantages which make it incapable of affording alone a consistent guide of life.

5. *Morality and Theology Inseparable*.—Earnest consideration of the above difficulties leads to but one possible conclusion. If neither Morality nor Theology alone can be relied on as self-sufficient guides of life, then possibly both may be inseparable. Each will supply the defects of the other, and contribute to the other its own particular advantages. Thus may a rounded, consistent, hopeful life be looked for, neither leaning too much towards individualism, nor too much towards shallowness. The river of life should be neither wide and shallow, nor too narrow and deep. Either condition would impair its usefulness. A reasonable depth and width will enable it to bear all the necessary burdens of life, and enable the waters to find their way safely to the ocean of truth.

When this union of Morality and Theology is applied to the problem of Kingsley, it becomes immediately evident how wise and just such a solution is. A thing is right because God wills it, but God wills it because it is right. This logical difficulty is only the omnipresent self-contradiction of life. Some day we may be able to solve it. To-day, common sense and the logic of facts drive the wisest to a recognition of difficulties which cannot be avoided, and a consistent course of harmony between the two.

6. *Moral Examination of Theology*.—Having decided that neither morality nor theology should be separated from each other, it may be useful to carry this principle into practical life. Since the truth is both theological and moral, all morality that conflicts with theology, and all theology which conflicts with morality must finally appear unsatisfactory. The residuum will then be the nearest approach that can be made to divine reality.

The morality that conflicts with a true theology is a question of practical life, which must be solved in the counting-room, the work-shop, the study, the paraenetic pulpit. To these fields of usefulness it must be left.

On the contrary, the theology that conflicts with morality is the proper subject of intellectual investigation. Its ascertainment is the object of the following pages. This question is not an idle one ; it is the result of the searching heart-anguish that comes to every sincere and earnest lover of truth. If a partial solution of these problems shall be helpful to others who have felt the same anguish, these pages will not have been written in vain and will have succeeded in bringing closer the day when all Christians will belong to one flock and one Shepherd, externally as well as internally.

In accomplishing this task it may appear that the criticism is too unmeasured, too violent, too searching. The writer would here beg the reader to forgive these unsparing investigations. The surgeon's knife cannot be too sharp. Yet mistakes and overstatements in individual passages may be blameable, and for these his charitable indulgence is invoked.

7. *Formulation.*—Before proceeding to a historical investigation of the theological disputes of history, it may be helpful simply to mention modern formulations of doctrines which are widely accepted in the domain of Soteriology ; but which may be criticized from the stand-point of morality.

This is the prevailing idea of the divine work wrought by Jesus Christ :

“Jesus Christ gave himself a ransom for us, undergoing the penalty due to our sins, and thereby releasing us from that punishment which God might justly inflict upon us.”—*Buck's Theological Dictionary*.

The “Presbyterian Confession of Faith” for the United States (1838) says :—“Christ, by his obedience and death, did fully discharge the debt of all those that are thus justified, and did make a proper, real and full satisfaction to his Father's justice in their behalf.”

And the Catechism (1839) for the Methodist Episcopal Church says :—“Christ, by means of his sufferings and death, offered a full satisfaction . . . to Divine Justice for the sins of the world.” And the reason assigned is : “Because he was perfectly righteous, there was an infinite value and merit in his death which was undergone for our sakes and in our stead.”

This is the Confession of Faith of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, published in 1838 :—“Christ, by his obedience and death, did fully discharge the debt of all those that are thus justified, and did make a proper, real, and full satisfaction to his Father's justice in their behalf. He was given by the Father for them, and his obedience and satisfaction accepted in their stead.” (P. 55.)

In the same chapter of this work we are told that God justifies sinners “by imputing the obedience and satisfaction of Christ unto them” (1); and that “Faith thus receiving and resting on

Christ and his righteousness, is alone the instrument of justification." (2.) In other parts of the same work we find mention made of Christ having "borne the weight of God's wrath, satisfied his justice, procured his favor, purchased reconciliation," etc. (See pp. 44, 161, 168.)

In the Catechism (No. 2) of the Methodist Episcopal Church, published in 1839, it is stated (p. 14) that "Christ, by means of his sufferings and death, offered a full satisfaction and atonement to Divine Justice, for the sins of the whole world." And immediately after, it is added by way of explanation, that, "because He was perfectly righteous, there was an infinite value and merit in his death, which, being undergone for our sakes and in our stead, Almighty God exercises his mercy in the forgiveness of sins, consistently with his justice and holiness."

To quote a few passages from the *Formula Concordiae* which contained the accepted Protestant creed of that day : "Justification by faith alone, is remission of sins, deliverance from damnation, reconciliation with the Father, adoption as sons, and is effected by the imputation of the merit or righteousness of Christ."—"Good works have nothing to do with justification by faith."—"The business of justification is between God and us, and is to appease his wrath."—"If any one therefore, believes he can obtain the remission of his sins because he is possessed of charity, he brings a reproach on Christ by an impious and vain confidence in his own righteousness."—"Good works are to be utterly excluded in treating of justification and eternal life."—"The position that good works are necessary to salvation, is to be rejected, because it takes away the comfort of the gospel and gives occasion to doubt of the grace of God."—"That good works are necessary unto salvation, ought not to be taught and defended, but rather exploded and rejected by the churches as false."—Pp. 87, 89, 589, 704, 705, Leipsic edition, 1756.

And Martin Luther who first formulated this faith-alone dogma, says :—"A Christian cannot, if he will, lose his salvation by any multitude or magnitude of sins, unless he ceases to believe; for no sins can damn him, but unbelief alone. Everything else . . . is absorbed in a moment by that faith."—*Luther de Captiv. Bab. II.*, 264. *Comp. Dispu. I.*, 523.

Article XIII, of the XXXIX Articles, reads as follows :—"Works done before the grace of Christ, and the Inspiration of his Spirit, are not pleasant to God, for as much as they spring not of faith in Jesus Christ; neither do they make men meet to receive grace, (or, as the School-Authors say) deserve grace of congruity: yea rather, for that they are not done as God hath willed and commanded them to be done, we doubt not but that they have the nature of sin." Good works (*Art. XII*) are worth nothing in themselves, and are only the signs by which Faith, which saves us is known. "Albeit that Good Works, which are the fruits of faith, and follow after justification, cannot put away our sins, and endure the severity of God's judgment; yet are they pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ, and do spring out

necessarily of a true and lively faith ; insomuch as by them a lively faith may be as evidently known as a tree discerned by the fruit."

The Reformers were also clear on this point. "Thou seest how rich is the Christian ; even if he will he cannot destroy his salvation by any sins how grievous soever, unless he refuse to believe."—*Luther de Captiv. Bab., Tom. II*, p. 264. "Be thou a sinner and sin boldly, but still more boldly believe and rejoice in Christ. From him sin shall not separate us, no, though thousand thousand times in every day we should commit fornication or murder."—*Ep. Luther, Jena 1556, Tom. I*, p. 548. "If in faith an adultery were committed, it were no sin."—*Disput. Tom. I*, p. 523, *Luther*. Calvin (*Div. Inst. 11: 2: 11*) says :—"We assert, that by an eternal and unchangeable decree, God hath determined whom he will one day permit to share in eternal felicity, and whom he will damn. In respect to the elect the decree is founded in his unmerited mercy, without any regard to human worthiness, but those whom he delivers up to the damnation are, by a just and irreprehensible judgment, excluded from all access to eternal life."—Zwingli (*de Prov. 6*) says that God "moves the murderer to ... all the innocent, even if he is unprepared." See Beza, *Aphor. 22*.

Augustine of Hippo says :—"That the unbeliever who keeps the moral law ever so strictly as to its matter is condemned, whereas the believer who obeys it less is saved."—(*C. d. Ep. Pel. III: 5; de Spir. et Lit. 27, 28, sqq.*) All that is not of faith is of sin. This is binding on all Roman Catholics, for as a saint, there can be no error in the writings of Augustine ; and as a Doctor, his teaching is to guide Bishops and clergy in forming judgments in difficult cases.

CHAPTER II.

THE POLEMIC BETWEEN ABAILARD AND BERNARD.

1. *Polemic*.—In the providence of God it has often happened that the saddest and darkest episodes in the history of the Church have borne, in the course of time, useful fruit. Polemic, discussion, and discord have often darkened the charity of those who would have desired to follow the humble life of their Master. So it has come to pass that when circumstances required it, even so saintly a man as Bernard of Clairvaux had the courage to defend the Faith as he had received it and understood it, when Abailard in his Doctor's Chair at the University of Paris strayed into the realms of theology. The controversy itself aroused at the time the greatest interest. To-day, little or nothing is left of it beyond the letters which Bernard wrote to confute his opponent's theses, and the portions of Abailard's writings which were condemned by the Sorbonne. From these, however, it is possible to gather some indications of the views of the two contestants.

2. *The Theory*.—Bernard's Soteriology was the legal theory which at his time was universally accepted in the Church. The Devil has a just dominion over man, because by free will man consented to the Devil (1). Adam's free-will was merely a choice of Masters, God or the Devil. He chose the latter. The Devil, therefore (2), as the Prince of this world, has actual power over man. And because power was given to the Devil from God it must be just. It is also justly permitted by God. But, on the other hand, the Devil has "not rightly acquired but wickedly usurped this power."

With all deference to the Abbot of Clairvaux, it must remain a very difficult problem how this power could be of so contradictory a nature. Does it not require further explanation on the part of Bernard to make it plain how it is possible to acquire wrongly and usurp wickedly a power given by God, and which on this very account is just?

Abailard rejoins that implicit, at least, Bernard must be a Manichee, if he holds that the Devil could have power over man in spite of the Will of God, and that therefore, if we believe in the sovereignty of God, the power of the Devil can have been nothing more than that of a jailer, who holds authority from his superior master, God, to hold human beings in bondage.

Bernard holds that he has ground of complaint against Abailard in that he attributes "the whole of our salvation to

devotion, and nothing of it to regeneration." In doing this "it is evident, too, that, as far as he can, he would empty of meaning the dispensation of this deep mystery; for he places the glory of our redemption, and the great work of our salvation, not in the virtue of the Cross, not in the blood paid as its price, but in advances in a holy life (3)."

3. *Objections.*—Abailard has many objections to urge against the traditional theory of redemption. He professes himself unable to understand how the righteousness of Jesus can have anything to do with any other man's righteousness—for righteousness is the disposition of a will, and cannot be bought, sold, or exchanged from person to person. "Let righteousness be whose it may, it is none of yours (4)." Bernard answers, "why should not righteousness come down from another, when guilt came upon me from another?" "If from the one I was infected with concupiscence from my birth, by Christ spiritual grace was infused into me." This view of Bernard's is the statement of a partial truth, called out by a partial objection. He should have endeavoured to expound more clearly that in this transfer the moral element of personal responsibility must not be overlooked.

In Bernard's system, Christ died only for the elect (5), so that Abailard urges the question, if the elect were elect, how could they ever be under the power of the Devil? The answer is that just because they were elect they needed a liberator. Jesus died therefore only for the elect, not for the non-elect. A consequence of this is that, as election is instrumental in baptism, unbaptised infants are subject to damnation. "Perhaps he holds that as they have no power to love, so neither have they necessity to perish (6)."

Abailard asks, if the power of the devil over man was just, and under the power of God, and if God was omnipotent, why did not God free man by a simple word to the jailer or robber? What was the need of an Incarnation (7)? "And so, what necessity, or what reason, or what need was there, when the divine compassion by a single command could have freed man from sin, for the Son of God to take flesh for our redemption, to suffer so many and so great privations, scorn, scourgings, and spittings on, in short, the pains and ignominy of the cross itself, and that with evil-doers?" Bernard answers that "the reason of the deed was the good pleasure of the doer." "Who denies that there were, ready for the Almighty, other, and yet other ways to redeem us, to justify us, to set us free? But that takes nothing from the efficacy of the one which he chose out of many."

Abailard has no lack of objections. Here is one more. "Why" (8) "does the Apostle say that we are justified or reconciled to God by the death of his Son when he ought to have been the more angry with man, as he sinned more deeply in crucifying his Son, than in transgressing his first command by tasting of the apple?—But if that sin of Adam was so heinous that it could not be expiated but by the death of Christ, what expiation shall

suffice for that homicide which was perpetrated in Christ?—Did the death of his innocent Son so please God the Father that by it he was reconciled to us, who had committed such a sin in Adam, that because of it our innocent Lord was slain? Would he not have been able to forgive us much more easily if so heinous a sin had not been committed?" Bernard answers that the voluntary obedience of his Son pleased him so much that it became the power of salvation of all.

But Abailard has yet a further point to urge. "Is there any one to whom it does not seem cruel and unjust, that any one should require the blood of an innocent man as the price of something, or that the death of an innocent man should in any-way give him pleasure, not to say that God should hold so acceptable the death of his Son as by it to be reconciled to the whole world?" Bernard answers this:—"God the Father did not require the blood of his Son, but nevertheless, he accepted it when offered." (2) "It was not blood he thirsted for, but salvation, for salvation was in the blood." How was salvation in the blood?

Abailard at last speaks openly. "The whole reason why God appeared in the flesh was for our education by his word and example, or as he afterwards says, for our instruction; that the whole reason why he suffered and died was to exhibit or commend to us charity (9)." "That all this" (Christ's life) "is to be reduced to one reason alone, namely, that it was done merely that he might give man by his life and teaching a rule of life, and by his suffering and death might set before him a goal of charity (10)." "I think then that the cause and design of the incarnation was to enlighten the world with the wisdom of God and arouse it to love him." "But it seems to me that we were nevertheless justified by the blood of Christ, and reconciled with God by the special grace shown to us when his Son took upon him our nature and in it gave us our example both by word and deed until his death. He has united us so closely with him by his love for us, that we are forced by so great benefit of Divine grace and will hesitate at no suffering, provided it be for him (11)." Bernard with his usual insight asks, if Jesus taught righteousness, would he not also have bestowed it?

4. *Abailard's own Opinion.*—So far does the polemic of Abailard with Bernard proceed. The further opinions of Abailard are taken from his own works, and are useful only to explain more fully his stand-point, and incidentally the positions which Bernard felt it his duty to oppose.

Of Guilt and Grace.—"If it is true that man is not able to do anything good by himself, and that he is incapable of raising himself up in any way whatever by his free will for the reception of divine grace, without the help of that grace,—it does not appear on what ground, if he sins he can be punished. Does it not rather seem that he, (God) merits to be reproached (for giving him so weak and subvertible a nature). Man is able to embrace that grace which is offered to him by the reason which has, indeed, been bestowed upon him by God.—God puts his

grace before the eyes of all, and advises them in the scriptures and by eminent doctors to avail themselves of their freedom of will to embrace this offered grace—but the slothful, is entangled with carnal desires, and although he desires to attain blessedness, yet he is never willing to endure labor in restraining himself from evil, but neglects to do what he ought, although he would be able by his free will to embrace the grace offered to him, and so he finds himself passed over by the Almighty (12). ”

Of Adam's Sin.—“ It should be known that when it is said, original sin is in infants, this is spoken of the penalty, temporal and eternal, which is incurred by them through the fault of their first parent—similarly it is said, ‘ In whom all have sinned’ (Rom. V : 12), in the sense that when he (our first parent) sinned we were all in him in germ. But it does not therefore follow that all have sinned, since they did not then exist; for whoever does not exist does not sin (13). ”

Of Works.—“ I say that they (S. Matth. XXV : 46, Jno. V : 29), were eternally recompensed by God either for good or evil; nor is the man made either better or worse because of works at least only so far as that while he is doing them his will towards either good or evil gathers force. Nor is this contrary to the Apostle, or to other authors, because when the Apostle says ‘ God will render to each,’ etc., he puts the effect for the cause, that is to say, the action for the will or intention (14). ” We see that here Abailard does not endeavor to break down the distinction between right or wrong, but simply emphasizes the well-known ethical fact that to God man stands or falls by his intentions, not the external deeds. Jesus meant the same thing when he said that he who even looked at a woman had committed adultery in his heart.

Of Sin.—“ There is objected to us the action of the Jews who have crucified Christ; that of the men who in persecuting the Martyrs thought that they were doing God service; and finally that of Eve, who did not act against her conscience, since she was tempted, and yet it is certain that she committed sin. To which I say that in truth those Jews in their simplicity were not acting at all against their conscience, but rather persecuted Christ from zeal of their law; nor did they think that they were acting wickedly, and, therefore, they did not sin; nor were any of them eternally condemned on account of this, but because of their previous sins, because of which they rightly fell into that state of darkness. And among them were even some* of the elect, for whom Christ prayed, saying: ‘ Father forgive them, for they know not what they do.’ (Luke XXXIII : 34). He did not ask in this prayer that this particular sin might be forgiven to them, since it was not really a sin, but rather their previous sins (15). ”

Of Binding and Loosing.—“ That which is said in S. Matthew, ‘ whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth,’ etc. (XVI : 19), is thus to be understood: ‘ Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth,’ i. e., in the present life, ‘ shall be bound also in heaven,’ i. e., in the present Church.—The Gospel seems to contradict us when

we say that God alone is able to forgive sins, for Christ says to his disciples 'receive ye the Holy Ghost ; whosesoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them,' (Jno. XX : 22—23). But I say that this was spoken to the Apostles alone, not to their successors.—If, however, any one shall say that this applies also to their successors, it will be needful in that case to explain this passage also in the same manner in which I have explained the preceding (16). ”

The practical application of all this Platonism was the famous Platonic Soteriology : “ Know thyself,” for we are informed in Letter 188, that Abailard had written a book called “ Know Thyself.” This suggestive title indicates its whole contents.

CHAPTER III. HUMAN RUIN ACCORDING TO ANSELM.

1. *The Question.*—The question which Anselm seeks to solve is the following : What was the need of the incarnation ? Why did God become man ? The preliminary answers to this question are three : (1) "the human race, so precious a work of God's, was utterly ruined" ; (2) "it was not fitting that what God had purposed respecting man should be completely brought to naught" ; (3) this plan of salvation "could not be carried into effect unless the human race were liberated by the Creator himself (1)."

To this discussion Anselm proposes to proceed by pure reason, ignoring Christ and Christianity. He proposes to prove that Christ must have died for our sins, and that he must have been God and man (2).

2. *Original Sin Assumed.*—Anselm assumes original sin as a matter of course. "Through the course of the first sin he (man) is conceived and born in sin (3)." "Through Adam and Eve sin passed by descent to all men (4)." "To inquire what original sin is, and how it passed from our first parents to the whole human race (5)."

"It had been decreed by the just judgment of God, and confirmed as it were, by a handwriting, that man who by his own accord had sinned, could by his own efforts escape neither sin nor the punishment of sin (6)." Thus though man might be justly tormented by the devil, it would nevertheless be unjust for the devil to torment him."

Anselm states that he did it by the permission of his (God's) "incomprehensible wisdom." How can God allow that which is unjust ? How can that which he, justice, permits, be unjust ? The only reasonable plea why the devil was unjust is "just as in a good angel there is no injustice at all, so in a bad angel there is absolutely no justice." But this then makes the conception of justice meaningless, as justice will mean only whatever an angel chooses to do, and injustice whatever the devil may do. No wonder that in Anselm's opinion hope of salvation for the devil was an utterly self-contradictory conception.

Consequently, man is helpless. "Man has been created for a blessedness which cannot be obtained in this life, and which no one can attain to except by the remission of his sins ; and that no man passes through this life without sin ;—The remission of sins is therefore necessary to man, that he may attain to blessedness (7)." One who is a sinner cannot justify another sinner (8).

3. *Sin as Debt.*—The worst part of this helplessness is that it makes man unjust. Sin is a debt. Man is unjust not to repay it. But man has nothing to repay it with. Therefore he is unjust because helpless, whether he wishes to repay or not (9). “Forgiveness ought not to be granted except when the debt is paid which is due for sin (10).”

Anselm conceives of sin as a debt. Adam was not, in Paradise, free. He belonged to God, with the possibility of stealing himself from God. “Just as by the very fact that he was overcome, the devil stole what was God’s and God lost it ; so by the very fact that he (man) overcomes, the devil loses it and God recovers it (11).” The Lord is master whatever we do. “Either the sinner says of his own accord what he owes, or God takes it from him against his will. For either man of his own free will, shows the subjection he owes to God by not sinning, or by making satisfaction for sin ; or else God subdues him though unwilling by tormenting him, and this shows that he is his Lord (12).” All that a man can do is no merit, only his duty (13). A man’s utmost “repentance, contrite heart, humility, fasting,” etc. are only what God requires of him. Hence, if he has once gotten into debt, nothing he can do can ever give satisfaction for it, as all his present and future resources are needed not to get into further debt. Sin is not rendering to God his due (14). “The entire will of a rational creature ought to be subject to the will of God,—this is the debt which both angels and men owe to God—As long as he does not repay what he has stolen, he remains in fault ;”—This is Anselm’s conception of sin as a debt. But from what preceded we hold that Anselm is mistaken as man in the original case of sin did not receive any equivalent. The devil received the equivalent, not man. The devil, not man owed the debt.

Instead of acting as God’s purpose was, “for the vindication and honor of God and the confusion of the devil,” he acted for the confusion of God and the vindication and honor of the devil (15). Since man’s utmost resources only kept him out of present and future debt, he can never hope to repay for Adam’s sin, which is transmitted to him by birth. Nay, even if by turning his head against the will of God he could save from destruction thousands of worlds as populous as this earth he should not do it, for he could never hope to repay for it (16).

4. *Satisfaction for Debt.*—Leaving behind these difficulties in the conception of a debt, Anselm holds that satisfaction must equal the debt (17), nay, it must be greater than the original debt (18), and even this does not suffice if it be not dictated by what Anselm is pleased to call the “proper disposition” (19). Few human usurers would be as hard as this, to demand beyond principal and interest, the “proper disposition.” God was by Adam defrauded only of one moment’s obedience ; now he requires full payment of that debt at the hand of every single one of the millions descendants of Adam ; as if a father’s debt should be required whole of each one of his children : so the creditor would receive three or four or many times the original debt.

Granted that man owes a debt, and should repay it ; granted that man neither has nor ever can hope to have anything to repay it with. What shall the creditor do ?

5. Why God Chose this Means of Salvation.—Anselm says God could have by his own will in a second restored all things to their former condition. “ But God is in need of no one, and could restore all things, were they to perish, just as he made them (20). ” Evidently God does not need the repayment of the debt ; he is in need of no one. Why then does he not forgive the debt ? If he does not it is vindictiveness. Nothing man can do can honor him, for he is the master of man whether the latter is willing or not (21). Why should he not just remit it ? (1) “ It is not proper to remit any irregularity in his kingdom (22). ” (2) “ God will treat in the same way him who sins and him who does not ; a thing which is not befitting God (23). ” (3) “ No one is ignorant that the righteousness of men is under a law, so that the measure of reward recompensed to it by God will be according to its quantity.—But if sin is neither paid nor punished, it is subject to no law.—Therefore unrighteousness is more free than righteousness, if it is remitted by mercy alone and this is very incongruous ; nay more, this incongruity reaches even this point, that it makes unrighteousness like God : for as God is subject to no one’s law, so, too, is unrighteousness.” One moment after giving as a reason for diabolical cruelty that God would not tolerate any body or anything being even like himself, above all law, Anselm further tells us the very opposite : that “ if it is not becoming to God to do any thing unjustly or irregularly, it is not within the scope of his liberty, or kindness, or will, to let go unpunished the sinner who does not repay to God what he has taken away.” “ His liberty only extends to what is expedient or becoming : nor is that to be called kindness which effects anything unbecoming to God. But when it is said that what he wills is right, and what he does not will is not right, it is not to be understood that if God were to will anything unbecoming it would be right because he wills it (24). ” Therefore while mercy is human, vengeance is divine. “ There is no contradiction in this ; because God bids us do this that we may not take upon ourselves what belongs to God alone.” Man is therefore to be kind, not because kindness is itself good, but because he does not know enough to revenge himself. “ For no one has right to take vengeance excepting he who is Lord of all. For when earthly rulers do this rightly, God himself does it, by whom they were appointed for this very purpose (25). ” Consequently, it would take away from God’s honor to forgive sin. “ There is nothing therefore that God preserves more justly than the honor of his own dignity.—Does it seem to you that he will preserve it in its entirety if he permits it to be taken away from him in such a way, that it is neither repaid, nor does he punish the person who took it away ?—It is necessary therefore that either the honor taken away be repaid or punishment follow ; otherwise either God will be unjust to himself, or he will be power-

less to secure either alternative—a thing it is wicked even to imagine (26)." So far we have not yet found one single reference to the moral injury of the fall. This omission will not fit in at all with his argument, but he foists it in, so that his argument seem not too bare. Yet this "cleansing" is said to be "without any satisfaction (27)." What is the use of so impotent and theoretical a "cleansing?"

CHAPTER IV.

NECESSITY OF SALVATION ACCORDING TO ANSELM.

1. *Why Need Man be Saved?*—If man was ruined, why did not God leave him ruined, and let him thus die out? Because it did not befit him to let the human race die out.

Man was created to fill up the gap left in the heavenly city by the fall of the angels; more men attaining perfection than angels fell, in order that men might not rejoice at the fall of the angels over them (1). “It is certain then, that God purposed to replace from among men the angels who had fallen (2).” The angels had never sinned: so if men sinned they must atone for sin before being admitted to equality with the angels (3). But this is a necessary action on the part of God, strange to say. “For it is inconsistent for God to bring man with any stain on him to that state for which he created him without stain, lest he should seem either to repent of his good undertaking, or not to be able to fulfil his plan; much more impossible is it, on account of the same inconsistency that no man at all should be promoted to that state for which he was created (4).” “It is needful therefore that in regard to human nature God should perfect what he begins. But as we have said this cannot be done except by a complete satisfaction for sin, which no sinner can make (5).” “But if this is so, it seems as if God was compelled by the necessity of avoiding what was unbefitting to provide salvation for man (6).” The question then occurs, God saves man for his own honor’s sakes, not for man’s sake; he is not then worthy of gratitude for it. Anselm answers: “But when of his own accord he brings himself under the necessity of conferring a benefit, and willingly endures it, then indeed he deserves more gratitude for his benefit (7).” Gratitude was due to God for creating man in the first instance. We may ask first, whether gratitude as such can ever be due from any one: for the essence of gratitude is voluntariness. “Man created in Paradise without sin, was, as it were placed there for God, between God and the devil, that he might overcome the devil by not consenting to his persuasiveness to sin, for the vindication and honor of God and for the confusion of the devil (8).”

2. *Why Cannot Angels be Saved?*—This brings us to the subject of the fallen angels. Why did he feel called upon to save man and not the angels? Was the sin and misery of both not the same?

We must remember we have no right to ask this question : God did not save man because he felt for man's weakness and pain, but because he wanted the number of fallen angels made up in the heavenly host. Besides, although Christ's death and merits overweighed all sins whatsoever, Christ did not save all ; he only died for the elect. " For we believe that many of them have been saved, and that numberless others are not saved (9)." " The life of this man (Jesus) was exalted and so precious that it may suffice to pay what is due for the sins of the whole world and infinitely more (10)." Here God is in the position of a creditor who receives sufficient money to pay capital and interest of the debt due him, and only is willing to release a certain number of the debtors while "numberless" debtors are eternally condemned, although their debt has been paid.

The only reason, then, why God did not save the angels was that he could with less trouble create new creatures to replace the fallen angels than to save them ; but his new creature confounded him and vindicated the devil, so he was forced to save him. (1) " One angel is not sprung from one angel, as all men are all from one man." (2) " As they fell through no one else by injuring them caused their fall, so without any other person's help they ought to rise again." — " But I do not say this as if the price paid by his death may not, though its great value, avail for the sins of men and angels, but that immutable reasoning is opposed to the restoration of the lost angels (11)." But why could not Christ become an angel, if he could become man, and men were equal enough to angels to take the place of the fallen angels, as equal to the angels which had never fallen, as we saw above ?

3. *How Shall Man be Saved ?*—It is now understood that man must be saved ; the question occurs now, what manner of salvation should be chosen ? We have seen already why God did not save men from his wrath by merely ceasing to be angry, or why he did not save them by a word, as he created them (12). The question arises, who should undertake this work ? Not an angel, for man must be considered the servant of whoever redeems him, and it was not fitting that man should be the servant of any but God, especially as he was to become equal to the angels (13). Therefore none but God could undertake to free man. But why should he choose this particular way, and none other ? Anselm affirms both differing opinions. On the one hand, the way which was chosen was not the right one because it was the only possible. But since he himself with the Father and the Holy Spirit had determined that he should not show to the world the loftiness of his omnipotence in any other way than by death, inasmuch as it had been determined that this should be done only by means of that death when the exaltation is effected by means of it, it is not improperly said to be done on account of it (14). " He speaks indeed of his Father's will, not that the Father preferred the death of his son to his life, but because the Father was unwilling that the human race should be restored unless one who was man should do some great act.

such as that death of his was.—It is as though he said ‘Since thou willest that the reconciliation of the world shall be effected in no other way, I declare that in this way thou willest my death :’—because he willed that the world should not be saved in any other way except by man doing some great thing, as I have already said.” Why did God choose this way of salvation, and none other? “Because reason did not in any way require this to be done, but altogether forbade it, since God does nothing without reason (15).” But did God choose the historical way because it was the right one? No: his choosing it made it the right one (14). Again Anselm says that there was no other way (15), without specifying any reason for this statement. From original sin, and from the nature of satisfaction, there was needed some one more than man to atone for him, to pay his debt. Now, this is exactly the Christian position (17). It is objected that the life of Jesus was a humiliation of the Deity: it is retorted that the divine element in him was impassible and only the human element suffered and was humiliated (18). But it is answered that God was cruel in requiring the death of an innocent person; Anselm retorts that Jesus offered his life freely (19), although at the same time Jesus is represented as obeying the command of the Father (20) as any human being must yield this obedience; but as Christ alone was sinless, this obedience could not be required of him, and was therefore voluntary (21). His death was “pleasing to the king himself (22).”

4. *Why Christ was Needed.*—We saw that no man could pay the debt; it remained then that some being above man should do so. For reasons given above, it could not have been angel; it must therefore be God. But at the same time he who pays must be a man, or one of the race for whom the debt is paid—so the saviour must be a God-man just as the saviour of angels would have to be a God-angel (23). Now, “as it is right that man should make satisfaction for man’s fault, it is also necessary that he who makes satisfaction should be the same person, or if the same race, as the sinner, for otherwise neither Adam nor his race would make satisfaction for themselves. Therefore as through Adam and Eve sin passed by descent to all men, no one except themselves or one who was born of them, ought to make satisfaction for the sins of men (24).”

5. *The Sinlessness of Jesus.*—This last subject leads us directly to the sinlessness of Jesus, which “could be praised.” “We may accordingly say respecting Christ, that he was able to lie, ‘if it is understood if he willed to do so.’ But since he could not lie against his will, and could not be willing to do so, he can none the less be said to have been unable to lie.” The angels who “Earned the power of no longer being able to sin by the fact that they could sin but would not (25),” are to be praised (26). “In this way therefore he (the angel) possesses a righteousness from himself, (for a creature cannot possess it from himself in any other way), and therefore he is to be praised for his righteousness.” And he is not righteous by necessity, but by his free will, for that is improperly called necessity when

there is neither compulsion nor prohibition. Wherefore God has in perfection, from himself all that he possesses he is to be praised most of all for the excellence he retains, not by any necessity but as said above, by His own immutability (27).

But that Anselm thought he has proved Christ both impeccable and worthy of praise apart from this appears from the answer to Boso's question (28). "Since God could make such a man, why could he not make angels and the two first human beings such that in like manner they could not sin, and yet should be worthy of praise for their righteousness." If Anselm had understood what he himself had proved he would have answered, "because impeccability only comes from successful peccability, which cannot be created suddenly, but must develop." But on the contrary his answer is: "Because it was neither possible nor proper that any one of them should be just the same as God, as we assert of that one man,—because reason did not in any way require this to be done, but altogether forbade it, since God does nothing without reason (29)." The question arises immediately, how came it that Jesus was born without sin, whereas all other men were born with sin (30)? Because the Virgin Mary was made pure by anticipatory belief in his death.

This theory is unthinkable and unintelligible, since the law of sufficient reason is of universal application. Not even is it possible to say that in eternity cause and effect are simultaneous—for, in the events of his life on earth the effect preceded the cause by thirty-three years, at least.

6. *How the Effects of Jesus' Death are Applied.*—As to the manner in which the effects of his death were applied to man, Anselm contents himself with saying: "So great was the efficacy of his death that its virtue extended even to those who were not living at that time and place (31)." As we saw that being without original sin debarred Jesus from saving man, on man's part, we must ask why he had to be without original sin. Because otherwise he could not have saved man on God's part—being himself God (32). It was a great sin to injure him (33); but as the murderers did it without knowledge, they were guiltless (34). The Father did not become incarnate lest there should be two grand sons in the Trinity, and because "it sounds more suitable" for the son to pray for the other than for any other person to pray to either of the others. But there is one aspect of the question which we must not overlook. All things that the Father had were the Son's (14); therefore when the creation became ruined, the Son was the one who was anxious to restore it. Besides (35), "Since he himself is God, the Son of God, he offered himself for our honor, to himself, as he did to the Father and the Holy Spirit;—However that we may speak more clearly what we wish (while abiding in the same truth) let us say, as is our wont, that Son fully offered himself to the Father." The recompense of this his act cannot be paid to him; since he is God and has all things already:

therefore the merits must be assigned to man (36), for the Father out of Justice does not keep back the recompense even if the one who deserves it cannot receive it. "For what greater mercy can be conceived than when God the Father says to the sinner condemned to eternal torment, and having no power to redeem himself from them, accept my only begotten Son, and give him for thyself ; and when the Son himself says, 'take me and redeem thyself, (37) ?'"

CHAPTER V.

LIFE AND LABORS OF PELAGIUS AND COELESTIUS.

1. *Pelagius*.—The name “Pelagius” is supposed to be a Greek form of the Cymric Morgan (muir-gin). He was at any rate called Brito by his contemporaries. Jerome described him as very stolid, and weighed down with Scotch seriousness. Although a layman, he adhered to monastic discipline, and “distinguished himself by his purity of life and exceptional sanctity.” Augustine says of him that those who knew him say that he was a good man, and one to be praised. He was known to be very learned, and his moral life was unexceptionable. He appeared at Rome at the beginning of the 5th century (ca. 400 A. D.), and was much shocked at the low tone of morality prevalent, as the people depended on magical sacraments. Pelagius opposed such a state of affairs, but was met, by the usual excuse of weakness. “It is hard, it is difficult, we cannot, we are men, surrounded by frail flesh.”—He opposed also the Augustinian saying “give what thou commandest, and command what thou wilt.” He often said “If I ought, I can.” “The body is not to be broken, but to be ruled.” He published his commentaries on S. Paul at Rome before the year 409.

2. *Coelestius*.—Coelestius was a friend of Pelagius’s, trained to be a lawyer, but soon determining to enter the ministry, became a monk. The approach of the Goths drove both Coelestius and Pelagius to Northern Africa. Pelagius was received in a friendly spirit by the Christian bishops, including Augustine; but he soon left Carthage for Palestine. Coelestius remained and sought ordination. Paulinus a deacon of Milan accused him to Aurelius of Carthage of holding the following opinion: (1) Adam would have died even if he had not sinned. (2) Adam’s sin injured himself alone, and not the human race. (3) Newborn infants are in the same condition in which Adam was before his transgression. (4) Since the whole human race does not die in Adam’s sin, so then it does not rise in Christ’s resurrection. (5) The law, as well as the gospel, yields entrance to heaven. (6) Before the coming of Christ there existed men without sin: *impeccabilis*, i. e. *sine peccato*. According to Mercator, Coelestius acknowledged these positions holding them to be still open questions, but a Provincial council declared against him. After a vain appeal to Rome he went to Ephesus and was there ordained.

3. *Labours of Pelagius and Coelestius.*—Pelagius had been received in a friendly spirit by Jerome in Palestine, until in 415 a Spanish monk Orosius was sent by Augustine to Jerome in order to warn him of the opinions of Pelagius. The first effect of this was a trial before John of Jerusalem on a charge of holding that man may be without sin if he desires it, which charge was not substantiated. The second effect was a trial before fourteen bishops at Diospolis, being accused by Heros of Arles and Lazarus of Aix. His statement that God gives man the ability to keep from sin if he so desires was accepted. Augustine and the North-African Church were much angered; and the synods of Carthage and Mileve, 416 A. D., sent an appeal to Innocent of Rome. He decided in their favor, on "the broad, popular and unanswerable ground that all Christian devotion implies the assistance of divine grace, that it is admitted in every response of the service and in every act of worship." Zosimus of Rome however accepted Pelagius's "Confession of Faith" brought to him by Coelestius, together with a favorable letter of Praylus of Jerusalem. He reversed Innocent's sentence, and wrote unfavorably to the North-African bishops. These assembled in 418 A. D., at Carthage, and again condemned Pelagius. The Emperor Honorius decreed from Ravenna banishment and confiscation against Pelagius and Coelestius, who consequently fled from Rome when Zosimus called him to a new trial. Zosimus subsequently recalled his own decision, and affirmed the action of Innocent, demanding all Italian bishops to subscribe his decree. Nineteen of these, led by Julian of Eclonium, a man of good birth, education, and sanctity, refused—but their opposition was overcome by the decree of the general council of Ephesus in 431 which condemned Pelagius by name, but without stating the condemned doctrines. Nothing further is known of Pelagius and Coelestius.

4. *Augustine's Setting of the Facts.*—We must proceed to set forth the doctrines of Pelagius. We must notice, however, that for the most part we only know of them from the writings of his opponents, so that we may be quite sure they are not too favorably represented; and much that might be said for him, if we had all his writings, must be omitted entirely; for what we have of his works, principally his famous letter to Demetrias, does not go into all details, and it is very uncertain whether the fragments we possess of his earliest work, the commentaries, have not been tampered with. It may be proved logically, if we take freedom of will as a postulate, that original sin does not hinder man from turning to the good. And if man possesses freedom of will he cannot need a redemption to save him from damnation. We will treat Pelagius's views on the question in the order indicated above.

CHAPTER VI.

FREEWILL ACCORDING TO PELAGIUS.

1. *Man's Possibilities.*—“In the freedom to good and evil consists the superiority of the the rational soul ; in this the honor, the dignity of our nature. Hence the best obtain praise and reward, and there would be no virtue in him that perseveres if he had not the power of changing to evil (1).” “God has endowed man with the power of being what he will so that he might be naturally capable, both of good and evil and turn his will to either of them. He has imparted to us the capacity of doing evil, merely that we may perform his will by our own will. The very ability to do evil, is therefore a good. It makes good to be preferred not by constraint, but voluntarily (2).” “We contradict the Lord when he say 'It is hard, it is difficult, we cannot, we men, we are encompassed with mortal flesh.' O blind nonsense, O unholy audacity. We charge God with a two-fold ignorance, that he does not seem to know what he has made, nor what he has commanded, just as if he forgetting the human weakness of which he is the author, has imposed on man laws which he cannot endure (3).” In his Confession of Faith Pelagius said : “We say that man always is able as well to sin as not to sin, by which we always confess, that we have a free will (4).”

2. *Man's Limitation.*—Yet Pelagius did not assert that men were without sin : he only said that it is possible for men to cease sinning (5). Purification cannot take place without long periods of effort (6). As long as we are on earth we should not think ourselves perfect, for we have receded if we have not advanced (7). Yet Biblical saints were without sin, as Abel, etc. (8).

3. *The Assistance of God's Grace.*—Yet in doing good, Pelagius admitted that God's grace was of assistance. “I said this concerning free will, to which God is an assistant when choosing good ; but man himself is in fault when sinning, of free will as it were (9).” Pelagius exhorted Demetrias (10) to look for the aid of the Holy Ghost. “It is very easy for man, in the study of holiness which God assists to remain sinless (11).” The ability of nature God always aids by the help of his grace (12). “We hold the grace of Christ to be necessary for all children and adults (13).” Wiggers (14) makes the following distinctions as to what Pelagius meant by grace : (1) free will (15) (2) the revelation, the law and the example of Christ, which facilitates the practice of virtue (16), (3) forgiveness of sins and future salvation (17). (4) Gracious influences by which the mind is en-

lightened and which assist every good work (18). Such being grace, we may notice its relation to man. (1) It does not act on man's will, but enlightens the mind as to what man should or should not do (what is God's will) (19). Part of this grace is the law and gospel, (20). (2) God only gives his Grace to those who merit it by the exercise of their free will (21). (3) Grace is not irresistible. "Under the name of grace they (Augustine) maintain fate when they say that unless God inspires the desire of good, even of imperfect good, into unwilling and resisting man he can neither turn away from evil nor lay hold on good.—We acknowledge baptism as necessary for every age, and that grace aids the good purpose of every one, but not that it implants the love of virtue in him while resisting, for there is no accepting of persons in God(22). "

CHAPTER VII.

ORIGINAL SIN ACCORDING TO PELAGIUS.

1. *The End of Salvation.*—Pelagius distinguished between an eternal life and kingdom of heaven ; entrance to the former a man's good works would secure ; to the latter, only Christian baptism could admit (1). Baptism has therefore a double function : to clean away all sins that might be present, and to give admittance to the kingdom of heaven (2). Wiggers states the Pelagian doctrine of baptism in the following manner (3). (1) Adults obtain by baptism remission of sins (4). (2) Infants obtain by it admission to the kingdom of heaven by a consecration to Christianity (5). (3) Infants obtain remission of sins they will afterwards commit merely in respect to the formula of the symbol "that the received custom may be observed (6)." (4) Baptism was in no way necessary to cleanse original sin, which they did not admit (7). The grace of baptism is so useful to all ages, that it is necessary to all (8). The difficulty of stating the Pelagian doctrine of baptism clearly comes from the fact that they never drew the logical deductions from their theory of free will. Had they done so, they would have rejected baptism as a means of salvation to all. Augustine did this for them (9). If the will is free and Christ's death not meritorious for all, why then should the heathens be admitted only to eternal life and the kingdom of heaven. Of two children if one were baptised and the other not (10), both would be unjustly treated by an arbitrary fate, respecting persons, consequently if fate is not arbitrary, but giving grace only for merit, the baptism cannot be of any value whatsoever; for either of the innocent infants have merited as much as the other ; so "eternal life" and "the kingdom of heaven" must be the same reality under two names. Baptism is thus superfluous. Again, what merit has a baptised infant acquired which an unbaptised one has not, that he should have that grace (11) ? If it be answered that a dead unbaptised child have been taken away lest he commit sin, then if God has regard to the good life of any one if he remains on earth, so must he have had regard for the bad life anyone would have led and damned him for it. And yet (12), it is said of the early death of a righteous person "he was removed lest wickedness should change his mind (13)." Here Augustine forced the Pelagians to recognize the impossibility of explaining God's ways. Instead of this, they endeavored to make the distinction between "eternal life" and the "kingdom of heaven," which is a distinction without a difference, in

order to accommodate the unavoidable conclusions of free will to the established practice of baptism. Yet, none of their contentions as to free will need have militated against the primitive form and meaning of baptism—which however, by this time had been forgotten. As to the question of original sin, however, they were perfectly clear, and their conception of baptism was wholly distinct from that ; for Pelagius is reported to have refused to say that an infant who has not been baptised would be lost (13) having done nothing wrong.

2. *Original Sin.*—This leads us to Pelagius's doctrine of original sin. Pelagius says (14) : “a sin propagated by generation is totally contrary to the Catholic faith, sin is not born with man, but is committed afterwards by man. It is not the fault of nature but of free will.—The mystery of baptism must not be so interpreted as to imply to the prejudice of the Creator, that evil is transferred by nature to man, before it is committed by him.” Propagation of sin implies propagation of souls, which is heretical (15). Adam was alone guilty for his own sin, as justice requires. Death is a natural necessity, not the punishment of Adam's sin. Adam sinned, but that affected himself, not his descendants. Sin is an act of a responsible or free will and cannot be inherited from another personality, whether parent or otherwise (16). In respect to his moral nature therefore, every man is born in the same state as Adam. This uncorrupted nature could by a habit of sinning become corrupted in adults by their own fault (17). Children are born without sin, and nothing is found in them but what God has created (18). Concupiscence is a natural attribute of human nature; and therefore good; only Manichees would deny this (19). Nevertheless, Adam's sin has an influence on all his descendants by their power of imitation of it (20). It is indispensable for procreation, and therefore present in paradise (21). Julian calls it “a natural and innocent affection” when kept within its prescribed limits (22), but this very undue exercise of concupiscence is owing to the free will (23).

CHAPTER VIII.

PREDESTINATION ACCORDING TO PELAGIUS.

1. *Soteriology*.—The logical result of Pelagius's attitude on original sin and free will is that God foreordains man only inasmuch as he foresees man's works are good or evil—which Augustine also acknowledges, as we shall see. Consequently there is no need of a redemption at all. The Pelagians were no sceptics, and did not draw the logical conclusions of their premisses ; rather they accommodated the ecclesiastical traditional doctrines to the truths of which they were certain. Consequently we will see as much hesitation, contradiction, and useless distinctions in their doctrine of the Redemption, as in that of Baptism.

2. *Foreordination is Prescience*.—“Jacob have I loved, and Esau have I hated” means only “God hated one of those not yet born, and loved the other, because he foresaw their future works (1).” And so in all other cases (2). In respect to Paul's parable of the Potter, Julian says : “A different end of the vessels is announced according to the diversity of human will (3).”

3. *Redemption*.—Christ was a teacher and a pattern (4), although God (5). His death was efficacious for sinners (6), but could be of no advantage to those who were not sinners(7).

CHAPTER IX.

THE ETHICS OF AUGUSTINE.

After stating the position of Pelagius, the student must turn to that of Augustine. Following Stöckl, we will begin with an outline of his Ethics, or view of human nature, from the standpoint of philosophy.

1. *Freedom of the Will*.—Freedom of will is an essential and inalienable part of our nature. "A free will was naturally created together with us (1)." The proofs of the freedom of the will are three :

(1) If the will be not free, it is only a psychical power moved and guided by instinct, and as such is not will. A will that is not free is unthinkable (2). It is not hard to see that his proof is a good example of the logical fallacy of begging the question.

(2) We know the will is free from our self consciousness of the fact (3). This argument is the only one which has not been questioned in modern times.

(3) The third argument is one which the evolutionists have attempted to account for by a gradual process of growth. Without the conception of freedom of will we could not account for the conceptions of good and evil, right and wrong, merit and guilt, reward and punishment, praise and blame, and the feeling of penitence (4). Augustine considers these proofs so convincing that he says : "A free will is given to the soul, which fact endeavoring to explain away by trifling argumentations, many are so blind that they do not understand or realize that they utter these vain and sacrilegious things by their own will (5)." "Whatever may determine the will, if it cannot be resisted, is complied with without sin ; but if one can resist it, let him not comply with it and it will not be sin (6)." "In all laws, warnings, punishments, etc. there is no justice if the will is not the cause of sin (7)."

If man did not have freedom of will, he could not, as he is, be the highest creature (8). "Goodness could not be predicated of a man, if he obeyed the commands of God by necessity and not from his own will. For this reason God gave him freedom of will (9)." Freedom may, of course, be misused ; but freedom does not cease to be a good. We should blame not God who gave it, but man, who misused it (10).

The providence of God does not destroy the freedom of the will, foreseeing that the actions are free,—not changing or conditioning them (11). Man does not act because God foresees : but God foresees because man acts (12).

2. *The highest Good*.—There are two kinds of good : of enjoyment, and of utility, the first is an end in itself, the latter a means to some further end (13). Now Augustine assumes that the highest end is happiness (14). His only endeavor is to connect this happiness with the idea of God. He does this by assuming

further that the highest good must (1) be our end in itself, (2) be inalienable, and (3) perfect (15). Now a highest good cannot lie in or beneath man (16). It must be above man : and therefore God (17). Man's highest happiness is the vision and consequent love of God (18).

Here Augustine is inconsequent. If the love of God is conditioned by the vision of God, then the end of man's efforts, his aim should be not the love of God, but the knowledge of God. Yet scriptural phrases force Augustine to abandon his false position, and to acknowledge that the ground of all law and virtue is love : to love well is nothing else than to love God with the whole heart, the whole soul, the whole mind (19). Such love forces us to live our whole life in relation to God (20), and to be a living sacrifice (21). Since God is man's highest good, it is man's interest to love God (22). To love one's neighbor as oneself means to give up self-love and to love our enemies (24).

3. *Evil*.—Every thing is good inasmuch as it exists (25). Evil is only negation and privation of good (26). Good being existence and evil non-existence. Good is possible without evil, but evil not without good (27). Absolute evil is absolute nonentity—so that the most wicked being is still good inasmuch as it exists (28). Evil as it appears is a defection a corruption a turning away from good, from measure, form, order, and a knowledge of God (29). There is therefore no positive evil, as the Manichees held.

Since God is all existence, to turn oneself from God to oneself, in selfishness, is to turn towards non-existence or naught (30). This selfishness, or pride is the origin of all evil in devil and man (31).

We see here in these three topics, a remarkable indication of Augustine's nature and powers.

As to freedom of will, his doctrine is not new nor remarkably different from philosophers who followed after ; but, as we shall see, his dogmatic views on the subject contradicted his philosophic views almost word for word.

As to the end of man, Augustine has thoroughly broken with Platonism. God and man are not of one nature : they are, as we shall see, of totally different nature: and to say that the vision and love of God are the end of man is only to make it more tantalizing, since man can never unite himself with God and become divine : but finds his highest destiny here or beyond, in looking at and desiring a loving God, whom he can never hope to reach, just as a cat may be permitted as its highest privilege to look at a king. Augustine calls this an end in itself—and yet instead of giving man eternal satisfaction it gives him only eternal and hopeless unsatisfied longing and desire which is the essence of love.

As to the question of evil, his philosophical treatment is only a restatement of Neo Platonism ; but when he treats it dogmatically, he looks upon it as a factor present in the world, and a positive quality. We must give up any hope of harmonizing the distinctly contradictory views.

CHAPTER X.

FREEWILL ACCORDING TO AUGUSTINE.

After having considered Augustine's philosophy we must turn to his theology, in respect to the crucial points at issue with Pelagius, and himself. We will begin as before with

1. *The Freedom of the Will.*—“True freedom would not have perished, if the will had remained good. But as the will has sinned, the hard necessity of having sin follows the sinner, until the whole infirmity be healed, and so great a liberty be received as that of a voluntary and happy necessity of living well and sinning no more (1).” “By the freedom of the will is come to pass that man should have sin; but now the penal vitiosity that ensued from liberty, has produced the necessity. For as the will has been subjugated by the corruption into which it fell, freedom has been wanting to nature.”—“By the greatness of the first sin, we have lost the freewill to love God (2).” “Man was so created with freewill, as not to sin if he willed not to, but not so, that if he willed he could sin with impunity. What wonder then, if, by transgressing, i. e. by subverting the rectitude in which he was created he is followed with the punishment of not being able to do right (3)?” By the punishment of sin each one sins in spite of himself (4).

2. *Freewill is Only to Sin.*—In spite of these assertions, he speaks of a free will, even when opposing the Pelagians (5). But this freewill which is not lost by Adam's fall is a freedom to evil, and not to good. “Man has only freedom for sin for freewill avails nothing except to sin (6).” “The will does not obtain grace through freedom but freedom through grace (7).”

3. *Grace Irresistible.*—Thus we see that Augustine's “free will” for good was limited to supernatural grace acting irresistibly on the will for that particular action: which is no freedom at all.

Grace is irresistible when given by God. “The hearing of the divine call is produced by divine grace itself, in him who before resisted; and then the love of virtue is kindled in him when he no longer resists (8).” “This grace which is secretly imparted to human hearts, by divine bounty, is rejected by no hard heart. For it is indeed given for the very purpose that the previous hardness of the heart may be removed. When therefore the father is internally heard and teaches, in order that men should come to the Son, he takes away the stony heart and gives the heart of flesh (9).” “The strongest man (Adam) God left to do what he would: but for the weak he has provided that they should by his gift most invincibly (indeclinabiliter) will

what is good, and most invincibly (insuperabiliter) will what is good, and most invincibly refuse to desert it (10)." "It is not to be doubted that human wills cannot resist God's will (11)." "The grace of God makes one not willing to be willing (12)." Yet Augustine refused to say that a man was forced to do good. "If he is compelled, he does not will (13)." The reason is that the good will is the effect of the compulsion, following it, so that there is no contradiction between man's will being good and this being compelled by God—a distinction without difference. A good example of this distinction is the "congé d' élire" which the queen of England sends to a cathedral chapter—with which "permission" they comply willingly by free election, on pains of being dismissed from their position in the chapter.

No good work can be done without faith, which is itself conditioned by preceding grace. But if salvation is the outcome of good works, preceded by faith, then salvation is a gift of grace: but as grace is irresistible, so is salvation, as we shall see later on.

Faith limits works: so that with it no bad thing can be done, nor any good thing without it, and faith is a gift of grace (14). Grace was necessary to illumine the understanding that it may come to true knowledge (15).

This preventer or preceding grace is directly in opposition to the Pelagian co-operating grace; for grace is afforded for every particular act (16). Even repentance which is sorrow at baptism and satisfaction for sins by receiving of punishment, is a gift of grace though accomplished by man's will (17).

God acts according to his freewill in giving grace—not according to worthiness, for there is no worthiness in man at all. We have no right to inquire into the reasons for such choice (18).

4. *Objections to Augustine's Theory.*—There are objections of Pelagians against Augustine's theory of grace. Wiggers presents these as follows (19). (1) "Augustinian grace destroys freewill. For those to whom grace is not imparted are impelled to sin against their will, 'by a necessity of the flesh' (20)." He answered a free will remained: but a "free will to evil"—whatever that may mean.

(2) Augustinian grace is "fate under the name of grace," for God becomes a "respecter of persons" if he confers grace for no worthiness but only for arbitrary choice (21). Augustine could only acknowledge a respecting of persons, but deny that respecting of persons is unjust (22). Such an answer trifles with the meaning of words, without answering the case.

(3) "It is unjust, in one and the same bad case that one should be freed and another punished." Augustine answers that if it was just for both to be punished, it is not unjust for one to be punished. As to the other, the grace of God is a free gift (23). The objection is not answered: for it is unjust to the punished to give grace to the other guilty one for no greater worthiness, arbitrarily, when God could just as easily pardon both.

(4) "Men who are not willing to live honestly and faithfully, will exculpate themselves; saying, what have we done who have lived wrong, inasmuch as we have not received the grace by which we could have lived right (24)?" Augustine had nothing to answer except to recall the fact that they had sinned in Adam and thus merited to fall (25). "He will be found ungrateful to grace itself, who chooses to live in sin, in consequence of grace, by which we die unto sin (26)." But then, grace is no more irresistible.

(5) The Pelagians showed that grace was not necessary for good works by quoting the virtues of the heathen (27). Augustine merely denied this "in toto," calling their virtues "splendid vices."

CHAPTER XI.

ORIGINAL SIN ACCORDING TO AUGUSTINE.

1. *Infant Damnation.*—Baptism frees from all sin, original and actual. The body also is purified, though its corruptions remains till death (1). Concupiscence remains through life but will not be counted as sin (2). Without baptism neither sorrow, daily prayer for pardon nor rich alms and benefactions avail anything (3). Children are baptised “for the remission of sins.” Actual sin children have not committed: therefore it is for original sin that they are baptised. “From what else are they redeemed but the death, the vice, the imputation, the subjection, the darkness of sin? Now since on account of their age, they have committed no sin in their own life there remains only original sin (4).” Again, Augustine holds that “as children are subject to no sins of their own life, the hereditary disease in them is healed by his grace who makes them well by the laver of regeneration.—But who does not know that what the infant obtained through baptism, profits him nothing in riper years, provided he does not believe, nor keep himself free from forbidden passions? But if he dies after baptism, the imputation to which he was subjected by original sin, is forgiven, and he will be perfected in that light of truth which illuminates the righteous in the presence of the Creator.” “Children born of parents ever so holy and righteous are not free from the imputation of original sin, if not baptised in Christ (5).” The change of man’s nature begins in baptism (6), and though baptised children are not conscious of it the Holy Spirit dwells in them (7). If baptism frees from sin, it saves: “Children who can neither will nor refuse either good or evil, are nevertheless compelled to be holy and righteous when, struggling and crying with fears against it, they are regenerated by holy baptism. For doubtless, dying before the use of reason, they will be holy and righteous in the kingdom of God through grace, to which they come, not by their ability, but by necessity (8).” Grace can be lost after attainment only by special wickedness in advancing years (9); but it would then seem that grace is not irresistible. If baptism is the only and sufficient condition of salvation all who are baptised are not saved; children as well as heathen. He said at first unbaptised children will be in mildest punishment (*in mitissima damnatione*) (10) and will be punished more lightly (*tolerabilius*) than those who have committed actual sin.

But he, Augustine, taught that there was no middle place for children (11). "Whether they die in their mother's womb, or after they are born, one must hold for certain and undoubted that they are *ignis aeterni sempiterno suppicio puniendi* (12)" "*interminabilia gehennae sustinere supplicia : ubi Diabolus.* (13)." "Our Lord will come to judge the quick and dead : and he will make two sides, the right and left. To those on the left hand he will say 'depart into everlasting fire,' etc. To those on the right 'Come receive the kingdom.' He calls one the 'Kingdom ;' the other 'Condemnation with the devil.' There is no middle place left where you can put the infants. . . . Thus I have explained to you what is the kingdom, and what everlasting fire : so that when you confess the infant will not be in 'the kingdom,' you must acknowledge he will be in everlasting fire (14)." Also : "If the child is not delivered from the power of the devil but remains under it, why dost thou wonder, O Julian, that he who is not allowed to enter the kingdom of God should be with the devil in eternal fire (15)?" The heathen are in as bad a condition as the infants : "That ignorance also which does not pertain to those who are unwilling to know, but to those who are as it were honestly ignorant, excuses no one so far that he is not to burn in eternal fire (*sempiterno igni non ardeat*) although he has not believed because he has not heard at all what to believe ; but perhaps he will burn the more gently (16)." The unbeliever who keeps the moral law ever so strictly as to its matter is condemned ; but the believer who obeys it less is saved (17). All that is not of faith is of sin (18).

Yet the good works of the heathen would influence the severity of their torments. Fabricius would suffer less than Catiline (19), and the righteous heathen would have in this life a temporal reward (20).

Yet of the unbaptised two classes of people would be saved : those who worshipped the true God and by prophecy believed in the death of Christ (21). Martyrs would be saved by the baptism of blood, an equivalent of that of water : baptism in every case being indispensable (22).

2. *Objections.*—Such were Augustine's views of infant baptism : and few will not echo Julian's invective against them : "The children you say, do not bear the blame of their own but of another's sins. What sort of sin can that be? What an unfeeling wretch, cruel, forgetful of God and of righteousness, an inhuman barbarian is he who would make such innocent creatures as little children, bear the consequences of transgressions which they never committed? God—you answer. What God? for there are Gods many and Lords many, but we worship but one God, and one Lord, Jesus Christ. What God dost thou make the malefactor? Here, most holy priest and most learned orator, thou fabricatest something more mournful and frightful than the brimstone in the valley of Amsanctus or the pit of Avernus. God himself say you who commendeth his love towards us, who even spared not his own son, but hath given him up for us all,

he so determines ; he is himself the persecutor of those that are born ; he himself consigns to eternal fire, for an evil will the children who, as he knows can have had neither a good nor an evil will (23)." To all this Augustine could only repeat the tale of Adam's sin and " O the depths of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God (24)."

3. *Transmission of Original Sin.*—Original sin is passed over to descendants not by imitation but by generation (25). It is effected by lust of the flesh (26). Christ is an exception because born of a virgin without concupiscence (27). This carnal lust is derived from the devil under whose power all are (28).

It was as punishment to Adam that moral corruption descended to his descendants (29). God punished sins by sins (30). The fruit was not bad in itself : the disobedience was evil (31). Moral corruption of his descendants did not follow as a natural consequence from his sin, but God annexed it, punishing sin with sin (32).

Death followed, temporally (33). " For nothing could originate from them different from themselves (34)."

Concupiscence, both proper sexual lust, and passion of all the members (35). Lust (sexual desire) is in every way sinful, and punitive, removing an incentive to struggle in the baptised although its guilt is taken away (36). It is always an evil, both in the continent who keep it in subjection and in the married who apply it to good, the procreation of children (37). Lust is the cause of mortality (38). Lust is in the body as well as the soul (39).

The sense of shame proves this (40).

The pains of parturition also (41).

The toil of laborers and the thistles of the earth (42).

All manner of human evils, ugliness, blindness, etc. (43).

Men are a mass of perdition, a condemned batch (44). Yet evil is only a quantity of affection, a vice, a languor ; not an evil (45). The primitive state of Adam was sinless, with a perfect nature (46). Adam had a perfect intellectual nature (47). Adam had a nature of free will: " posse non peccare " : he could sin or refrain from sinning (48). Man even before the fall needed continually God's grace : but then the grace was resistible, whereas after the fall it became irresistible (49). In Adam the mind had perfect control over the sexual passion, so that there was no shame in mentioning the sexual organs. There might have been connection without passion (50). If man had persevered in his " posse non peccare," he would have become impeccable : " non posse peccare " but as he fell he became sinful : " non posse non peccare." (51). If man had persevered, he would have attained a state of " non posse mori ; " or immortality major which we will attain only after the resurrection (52). He was in the state of " posse non mori ; " or immortality minor, before the fall ; while after the fall he was in the state of " non posse non mori " (53). The paradise was a perfect place. Child-bearing would have been painless, there was no suffering, trouble or disobedience, even among animals (54).

CHAPTER XII.

PELAGIAN OBJECTIONS TO THE ORIGINAL SIN DOCTRINE HELD BY AUGUSTINE.

1. *Descent of Guilt*.—We may notice here some of the objections of the Pelagians to Augustine's views as here presented " If baptism cleanses from that old transgression, then those who spring from those two that are baptised, must be free from this sin, for they cannot transfer to their descendants what they have not themselves (1)." His answer was that the guilt of lust was taken away in baptism, but that lust itself remained in the parents and could be thus transmitted (2). Yet, the parents could only transmit guiltless lust, after their own baptism, so that Augustine has not yet answered the question. He gives the instance of the foreskin, which is found in children of circumcised parents ; chaff, separated with care is still to be found in the product of purified wheat ; the wild olive tree may spring from the seed of the good olive tree ; the wild grape never springs from the seed of the good. Augustine recognises that it is a very wonderful thing that this transference of sin should occur. " And because it cannot easily be searched out by reason nor explained by language, it is not believed by unbelievers ; just as though what we have said of the wild and good olive, which are like in germ but unlike in kind could be easily investigated by any mind and explained in language. But this fact can be seen by him who is willing to make the experiment. It may therefore be for an example by which that may be believed which cannot be seen (3). "

2. *Marriage an Increase of Damnation*.—If infants are subjugated to the devil by birth, then marriage is an evil, as it increases the power of the devil ; therefore both it and its fruit is of the devil. Augustine had no answer to this beyond reiteration of his position ; marriage is an institution of God ; but sensual lust remains an evil. So far the objection has not been answered. The following quotations will show the Pelagian and Augustinian view of lust. Julian : " Whoever temperately uses natural concupiscence, uses a good thing well ; he who does not observe temperance, uses a good thing badly : but he who by the love of holy virginity, despises even the temperate use, does still better in not using a good thing ; because, in the confidence of his safety and strength he despises remedies, that he may maintain glorious contests (4)." Augustine says : " Whoever uses carnal concupiscence temperately, uses a bad thing well ; he who is not temperate, uses a bad thing badly ; but he who by the love of holy virginity despises even the moderate use, does still

better, in not using a bad thing ; because in the confidence of the divine aid and grace, he despises feeble remedies, that he may maintain more glorious contests." Wiggers says "Here Augustine argues sophistically against Julian, from the term 'remedy,' in order to convict him from his own reasoning. For no remedy, forsooth, can be employed against anything good, but only against an evil. But this could only prove that the term remedy was ill chosen, or at most, that Julian had attributed an undue value to entire confidence ; but not that he was wrong in asserting that concupiscence is in itself good (5)." Augustine seeks to prove his point thus : "Two good things which are both from God the Father, cannot be in conflict with each other ; but continence and concupiscence are in conflict (6)."

3. *Bondage to Devil*.—Why should a creature of God not be subject to God, but to the devil ? Julian says(7) : "Men are made by God on purpose that the devil may have them in his own right." "God and the devil have entered into a covenant, that what is born the devil shall have ; and what is baptised God shall have." Augustine had nothing to answer to the point ; he could only repeat that man had spoilt God's work and thus incurred punishment (8). "Men, as men, are the work of God ; but as sinners they are under the devil, if not rescued from him by Christ (9)." This does not answer the objection that when God creates a man who he foresees will not be baptised, God deliberately creates him to be eternally damned ; which is revoltingly unjust. Nay, Augustine goes so far as to say that God creates men who will not be baptised for the express purpose of increasing the power of the devil. "Yet God does not create men in order that the devil may, in a manner, have a family ; but by that goodness by which he causes all natures to exist, and by which he makes even the devil to subsist (10)." But this goodness to the devil means that man is created to be subject to him and eternal punishment. What goodness is it to make a nature subsist which without further sin is eternally damned in the everlasting fire, as an unbaptised baby is, supposing it is not born in a country where baptism is administered ?

4. *Why do the Sinless Suffer?*—If the pains of parturition are a consequence of the fall, why do sinless animals suffer in parturition, and the pain remain in baptised women (11)? Augustine denies that animals suffer ; which is absurd. But if they do "the punishment of the image of God then accrues to the condition of brutes ; but the punishment of the image of God could not be just if no fault preceded." This however is doubly unjust : for original sin then has spread to all animals, who can neither hear of Adam nor be saved by Christ. And how shall original sin have entered the nature of animals? Why should animals be punished for the sins of men?—The pains of parturition remain in women "in order that faith may be proved, by which we believe in a coming age when these things will not be." Then, there is no difference, on earth, between a baptised and an unbaptised woman.

5. *Necessity Destroys Merit.*—Pelagius said, “If men are thus because they cannot be different, they are not to blame (12).” “Sins ought not to be visited with even the smallest punishment, provided they cannot be avoided (13).” Julian said that freewill could not be lost by wrong use of it, for the badness of the will is a proof of its freedom. How could the capacity of its exercise be annihilated by the commencement of its exercise (14)? To answer these objections, which as we saw he himself had used against the Manichaeans, Augustine knew of nothing to the purpose. Sophistically he sometimes admitted a “free-will-to-evil,”—which is not “freewill” at all. Where all arguments failed he took refuge in the “depth of the wisdom of God.”

CHAPTER XIII.

PREDESTINATION ACCORDING TO AUGUSTINE.

1. *Predestination is Independent of Merit.*—“ Because by freewill Adam deserted God, he received the righteous sentence of God, that he should be condemned together with his whole race, which being as yet all placed in him had sinned with him. For as many of this stock as are freed are certainly freed from condemnation by which they were then held bound. Hence if even no one were freed, no one would blame God’s righteous decision. That a few, therefore, (in comparison with those that perish, though in their own numbers many), are freed, is of grace, is gratuitous, thanks are to be rendered for it, lest any one should be exalted as it were on account of his own merits, but that every mouth may be stopped, and he that glorieth may glory in the Lord(1). ” God chooses the saved not because of their merits because they are “ equalled in the damned (2). ”

“ Not by merit (for the whole mass was condemned as it were in the vitiated root) but by grace God elected a definite number (3). ” “ Not because we have believed, but that we might believe are we called (4). ”

“ The children of perdition God punishes in wrath ; but the children of grace he punishes in grace, for whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth (5). ”

“ The number of those who are predestinated to the kingdom of God is so certain, that not one shall be either added to them or taken from them (6). ”

“ Those who having heard the gospel and being changed for the better have not received perseverance,—have not been selected from that mass which is evidently condemned (7). ”

“ Why then does he not teach all so that they come to Christ? Because he has mercy on whom he will, and pardons whom he will (8). ” “ Many are not saved not because themselves do not will, but because God does not will it (9). ” “ If I am here asked why God has not given perseverance to those to whom he has given the love by which to live in a Christian way, I reply, I do not know. Inscrutable are his judgments and unsearchable his ways (10). ”

2. *Predestination to Damnation.*—Although Augustine held that God saved men by an irreversible decree, but did not damn them by one, as they died justly from their original guilt, and though he said “ One is taken and another is left, because great is God’s

grace and true is God's justice (11)," yet we read of the expression "predestined to eternal death (12)," and "predestined to be damned (13)." Those who prefer to do so may explain this decree as a conditionl one limited to God's prescience of man's sins and following condemnation (14).

But why should any be born except those whom God has de-signed for salvation? God shows his goodness, which would remain hid if no one received the righteous punishment (15).

3. *Redemption*.—Since grace is irresistible and many men are lost, it is plain that Christ redeemed only the elect. "Every one that has been redeemed by the blood of Christ is a man; though not every one that is a man, has been redeemed by the blood of Christ (16)." "No one perishes of those for whom Christ dies (17)." "By this mediator, God showed that those whom he redeemed by his blood, he makes, from being evil, to be eternally good (18)." "Christ redeemed the sinners who were to be justified (19)." Christ's redemption was two-fold (20). Firstly, his death freed the elect from the devil (21). Secondly, he was our pattern for us to imitate (22). But this example can have been only for the elect (23).

CHAPTER XIV.

WHO WAS THE INNOVATOR, PELAGIUS, OR AUGUSTINE?

1. *Pelagius's and Augustine's Moral Character.*—In comparing Pelagius and Augustine, there is no more salient contrast than that of their morality ; and of the bearing of their teachings on purity of life. Pelagius has never been accused even by his bitterest enemies of immorality ; we hear on all hands that he was of blameless life. Augustine is known to have been a most disgraceful profligate ; at his baptism he dismissed the concubine with whom he had lived 13 years, and who had borne to him his son Adeodatus, penniless and homeless, in order to marry ; and when an innocent girl had been found for him by Monica, and a delay of three months occurred in the day of the marriage, he was forced to get another concubine for the meanwhile. When Pelagius wrote his letter to Demetrias, on the occasion of her professing virginity, he began by giving an account of the lives of the biblical saints, so that an insufficient idea of the natural powers of human nature should not yield too low a standard of obligation, duty and attainment (1). The Bible often calls men “ Sons of God ” so as to encourage them, for as men have a low opinion of themselves, they are careless in their lives (2). For free-will is that part of our nature by which we excel all creation (3). On the other hand, the Augustinian saying “ Give what thou commandest, and command what thou wilt ” was the accepted maxim of the Roman clergy, who led scandalous lives, and excused themselves by saying their nature was too weak. “ It is hard, it is difficult, we cannot, are not able, we are human, surrounded by frail flesh. *Durum est arduum est, non possumus, homines sumus, fragile carne circumdati* (4). ”

2. *Who was the Innovator?*—We must now ask the crucial question, who was the innovator, Pelagius or Augustine?

As is usual in such disputes, both parties claimed to be orthodox. Each thought the other the innovator.

Augustine supposed that Pelagian heresy was “ the most recent heresy of all, originating from the monk Pelagius (5). ” Jerome, better acquainted with Greek than Augustine—for Augustine had learned only enough of that language to spell out his New Testament—knew better than this ; he said that it was due to several philosophers and Fathers, Origen (6), Rufinus and others.

The Pelagians asserted that their doctrine was orthodoxy, and accused Augustine of departing from the doctrine of the Church

and the Fathers, of whom they quoted Chrysostom with much zest.

3. *Orthodoxy Settled by Appeal to Writings.*—Since both parties claimed orthodoxy our only recourse will be to settle the point by comparing their doctrines with those of the Fathers.

As to the freedom of the will, the unanimous voice of the Fathers testifies that Pelagius was right in holding that it was not lost after the fall. Besides, none of the Fathers teach the Augustinian irresistible grace.

In respect to original sin and man's state before the fall, the Fathers differed from Pelagius, in holding that Adam would not have died if he had not sinned ; besides, the Latin Fathers had assumed an original sin ; and none even of the Greeks considered man as perfect and whole as Pelagius did. But they all agreed with Pelagius in denying that any child is damned for Adam's sin ; or that Adam's sin was imputed to his posterity.

As to predestination, and the extent of redemption, they all unanimously supported Pelagius, as against Augustine.

We may summarize : With the exception of the supposition that Adam would not have died if he had not sinned, and that the Latin Fathers had assumed some kind of original sin, they differed from Augustine in every crucial and minor point : that freedom of will was only to evil, that grace was irresistible, that unbaptised infants are condemned to the eternal fire, that Adam's sin is imputed to each one of them, that God foresees that some will not be saved, and that Christ died only for the elect.

Besides, Augustine foisted on the Church a system of doctrine, such as never had been known to the Fathers.

4. *Councilar Decisions.*—It is possible to show that during his lifetime, until the Council of Ephesus in 431 A. D., Pelagianism had only been condemned in the West, from which all the opposition to Pelagius had come. Whatever councilar decisions had been reached in the East and had been decidedly favorable to Pelagius and his cause. And finally we may remark that the decision of the council of Ephesus may be traced to the secular power which was ruthlessly employed in the cause of Augustinianism.

5. *Personal Contrast.*—It is difficult to judge impartially between Augustine and Pelagius at this so great a distance in time. Yet, using the scant material that remains to us, the case may be stated clearly by contrasting the two parties in point of personal morality, in point of learning, and in point of fairness in procedure.

As to personal morality. On Augustine's own showing, the character of Pelagius was unexceptionable. From Augustine's own confessions we learn what Augustine was shameless enough to record, that he was so libidinous that when in Milan his mother Monica desired him to separate from his concubine who had lived with him many years, and who had borne him his only

son Adeodatus, and desired him to marry a pure girl on the occasion of his baptism, he could not contain himself for three short months that were to elapse before the wedding, and casting out his faithful concubine on the street, he hired a harlot to gratify his lust for the meanwhile.

As to learning. Augustine acknowledges that Pelagius was learned. As a matter of history, Pelagius was familiar with the great theologians of the East, both personally, and by reading ; he lived with Jerome for a long while without his theology being questioned. Augustine himself did not know one word of Greek beyond what was absolutely necessary to spell out his New Testament. He knew absolutely nothing of all the theologians of the East. And the best proof of this is that he departed from their doctrine in the matter of damnation of infants, limitation of salvation, and predestination to damnation.

As to fairness of judicial procedure, the following facts of history may be interesting.

First. Wherever Pelagius had the opportunity of answering personally or by letter the charge made against him he was acquitted. First, by the unfettered John of Jerusalem. Then by the unfettered fourteen Bishops of Diospolis. Then by Praylos of Jerusalem. Then by Zosimus of Rome, on the strength of Pelagius's own Confession of Faith. Next, he was defended by the nineteen Italian Bishops of Italy who followed Julian of Eclonium.

Second. It is a matter of history that wherever Pelagius was condemned, he had no opportunity to defend himself, and for the greater part the accusers did not know him, or his language, as, for instance, Augustine. He was without hearing condemned, first by Augustine through the monk Orosius ; then by Heros of Arles and Lazarus of Aix, who may never have known Pelagius, and who certainly had not seen him for sixteen years. Then, the Synods of Carthage and Mileve without offering him any opportunity of defending himself, and some members of whom, if they ever knew Pelagius, could not have seen him for sixteen years. So Innocent of Rome condemned Pelagius unheard on a "broad, popular" ground. Again, the Synod at Carthage, in 418, A. D., as arbitrarily as before, although they had been by this time warned that there was much doubt as to Pelagius's criminality or heterodoxy. The next accuser and judge of Pelagius is the unordained, theology-ignorant, and himself questionably orthodox Emperor Honorius, without hearing any defence of Pelagius. This Emperor forced Zosimus to reconsider his opinion founded on personal knowledge of Pelagius, and to condemn Pelagius while the latter was absent. Finally, the General Council at Ephesus, under the iron hand of the unordained Emperor, condemned Pelagius, without stating what it condemned him for.

Third. We only know of Pelagius through his bitterest enemies, and have no proof that Pelagius did hold the opinions which Augustine accused him of.

Weighing all these facts it would appear that the whole controversy was not so much a theological controversy as an attack caused by private malice, spite, and malevolence, against a learned and moral man by a man who on his own confession was immoral, did not know the language in which the great theological works of the Church were written, who distinctly departed from their doctrine, and who never succeeded in getting a condemnation of his opponent except in cases when the latter had no opportunity to defend himself, or present a defence. No other conduct is to be expected from a man who originates the doctrine of the damnation of infants and all non-Christians, the limitation of salvation, and the predestination to damnation.

6. *The Fathers on Free Will.*—It may not be unprofitable, after discussing the opinion of Pelagius and Augustine to cite expressions of opinions on the part of the Fathers. It must always be remembered, however, that much as some of their opinions may seem to favor one cause, proofs for the opposite opinion may with equal ease be constructed from their writings, at times. In any case they were extremely unsystematic and an expression of their opinion is therefore more doubtful than that of a later writer would be.

It will be well to begin this investigation with a consideration of the question of free will and grace.

Augustine well says : "In baptism lust is extinguished in such a manner as that it is not extinguished, but rendered unable to impede free action (7)."

Gregory of Nyssa adds : "He who has proposed as the prize in the contest of a free will the guerdon of all good to those who are living virtuously, never, to please himself, subjected mankind to the yoke of a strong compulsion as if he would drag it unwilling as it were his lifeless tool towards the right (8)." "The man, who had enslaved himself by indulgence to the enemy of his life, being of his own accord in this unfortunate condition—(9)."

On the subject of free will, Justin M. says : "For if it be fated that this man be good and this other evil, neither is the former meritorious, nor the latter to be blamed. And again, unless the human race have the power of avoiding evil and choosing good by free choice, they are not accountable for their actions, of whatever kind they be (10)."

Irenaeus says: "But man, being endowed with reason, and in this respect like to God, having been made free in his will, and with power over himself, himself the cause to himself, that sometimes he becomes wheat, and sometimes chaff. Wherefore also he shall be justly condemned, because, having been created a rational being, he lost the true rationality (11)." Origen adds to this : "God the Father of all things, in order to ensure the salvation of all his creatures through the ineffable plan of his word and wisdom, so arranged each of these, that every spirit, whether soul or rational existence, however called should not be compelled by force, against the liberty of his own will to any

other cause than that to which the motives of his own mind led him—the place of rank obtained after victory be held with greater certainty, which should be established by the difficulties of the contest (12)." Tertullian believes the same thing. He affirms "man's unshackled power over his will, that what happens to him should be laid to his own charge, and not to God's (13)." Cyril of Jerusalem in his Catechetical Lectures speaks of the soul as "having free power to do what it willetteth. There is not a class of souls sinning by nature, and a class of souls practicing righteousness by nature: but both act from choice, the substance of souls being of one kind only, and alike in all. The soul is self-governed: and though the devil can suggest, he has not the power to compel against the will. For if thou wert a fornicator by necessity, then for what cause did God prepare Hell? If thou wert a doer of righteousness by nature, and not by will, wherefore did God prepare crowns of ineffable glory (14)?" Athanasius often affirms explicitly and implicitly man's freedom of will, and consequent responsibility (15). Gregory Nazianzen admits the principle of free-will, and consequent responsibility in the following words: "Then therefore all men do not seem to have been deemed worthy of the same rank and position; but one of one place, and one of another, each I think according to the measure of his own purification (16)." Gregory of Nyssa has much to say on the subject. "Now, liberty is the coming up to a state which owns no master and is self-regulating: it is that with which we were gifted by God at the beginning, but which has been obscured by the feeling of shame arising from indebtedness (17)." "For the soul immediately shows its royal and exalted character, far removed from the lowliness of private station, in that it owns no master, and is self-governed, swayed autocratically by its own will—for to whom else does this belong but to a king (18)?" "I mean the gift implied in being his own master, and having a free will. For if necessity in any way was the master of the life of man, the image would have been falsified in that particular part, by being estranged owing to this unlikeness to its archetype (19)." "Now, if in our representation of the Gospel mystery we had so stated the matter as that it was the Divine Will that the faith should be so granted away amongst mankind that some men should be called while the rest had no share in the calling, occasion would be given for bringing such a charge against this revelation. But if the call came with equal meaning to all and makes no distinction as to worth, age, or different national characteristics.—For he who holds the sovereignty of the Universe, out of excess for this regard for man permitted something to be under our own control of which each of us alone is master.—But where then would have been their free will? Where their virtuous merits (20)?"

Yet freewill is aided by the grace of God, as the ball-player cannot catch the ball unless it be thrown to him (21). Origen says: "For no noble deed has ever been performed among men,

where the divine word did not visit the souls of those who were capable, although for a little time, of admitting such operations of the divine word (22)."

Concerning the technical subject of Grace, the following references may be useful.

Justin Martyr considers that man's free will makes him worthy of grace (23). Irenaeus attributes to man free will and a desire to do good ; and to God illumination of the understanding (24). So also Theophilus (25). Clement of Alexandria (26) and Origen (27) attribute the fruition of a good will to God. Macarius and Basil both considered the exercise of human power the condition of divine grace. On the other hand, they speak very strongly of grace, which is, in its proper sense, quite compatible with the above position. Likewise both the Gregories. Chrysostom says (28) : "All is in God's power, so that our freewill is not lost, but depends therefore both on us and him. We must first choose the good, and then God adds what belongs to him. He does not precede our willing, that our free-will may not suffer. But when we have chosen, then he affords us much help. It is ours to choose beforehand and to will, but God's to perfect and bring to the end." Also other passages (29). "God imparts to us virtue. All does not depend on us. To choose good, to will it, to prosecute it with zeal, to make every effort, lies in our freewill ; but to accomplish it, to not suffer us to fail, and to reach the mark of good deeds, is the work of heavenly grace (30)." Jerome says (31) : "Freewill consists only in this, that we will and desire and approve of things required. But it is in God's power that we are able, by his help and his aid, to accomplish that we toil and strive for." Ambrose conceives that the will of man is dependent on an influence of divine grace, though he does not explain this the crucial point (32). Cyprian speaks strongly of grace, but yet in the Greek sense (33).

On our freewill is based an universal call to salvation. Origen says : "We think indeed that the goodness of God through his Christ, may recall all his creatures to one end, even his enemies being conquered and subdued. The lapse by which an individual falls away from his position is characterized by great diversity, according to the movements of the mind and will—in proportion to the desire of his declension and defection (34)." Cyril of Jerusalem adds : "For though remission of sins is given equally to all, the communion of the Holy Ghost is bestowed in proportion to man's faith (34)." From the following words it is evident that Gregory Nazianzen was not kindly disposed to those who denied free-will. "For there are people so evilly disposed as to think that some men are of an utterly ruined nature, and some of a nature which is saved, and that others are of such a disposition as that their will may lead them to either for better or worse (35)."

The slavery of the sinner to sin, which we shall see below, is the origin of the doctrine of a debt owed which must be remitted by some kind of an atonement. Gregory of Nyssa

says : " The man—who had enslaved himself by indulgence to the enemy of his life, being of his own accord in this unfortunate condition—thus leaving some colors of a just complaint to him who had enslaved man through sensual pleasure (36)." Here we see the individual fall described, as being individual, and consisting of sexual lust. " Therefore it behoves the man who grasps at the transcendent aim of all virginity to be true to himself in every respect, and to manifest his purity equally in every relation of his life (37)." " For it would be ridiculous to preserve the organs of generation pure, but not the tongue or to preserve the tongue but neither the eyesight, the ears, nor the hands ; or lastly, to preserve these pure, but not the mind, defiling it with pride and anger (38)." So Methodius. " All the irrational appetites of a virgin are banished from the body by divine teaching (39)." Thus we see that all other sins are considered as side issues of the main failing, which will follow as effects after the cause of lust has been removed. Thus lust is the sin " *par excellence*."

On this freedom of will is based a call to universal salvation, which is not limited in any way. This contradicts Augustine's conception that Christ only died for those who were predestined to be saved.

Ambrose, for instance, takes pains to use language which sounds almost like a conscious contradiction of the doctrine of Augustine. Christ promises redemption to all, so that no one need trouble, no one despair, as no one is excepted, but every soul is invited to grace, that it may be redeemed from crime without price, and man may obtain the fruit of eternal life (40). Much the same language is held in the Proceedings of the Council of Ephesus (41). The curious will find many like passages in Münster's book (42).

The call to universal salvation is familiar to many Fathers. " Neither childlessness, nor poverty, nor obscurity, nor want, can hinder him who eagerly strives after the knowledge of God." So Clement of Alexandria (43). Origen adds : " Every rational creature, without any distinction, receives a share of him in the same way as of the wisdom and the word of God (44)." Arnobius declares : " To all the fountain of life is open, and no one is hindered or kept back from drinking (45)."

If the case is then as we have seen it to be, it must follow that baptism can only be for the forgiveness of actual sin committed since birth, not for original sin whose guilt has been inherited innocently. The old ecclesiastical formula, that baptism is for the remission of sins, comes from the time that adults only were baptised.

Concerning baptism of infants, Tertullian is the first who mentions it exclusively and distinctly (46), only to disapprove of it. Origen (47) and Cyprian (48) approved of it. Tertullian says : Why hastens the innocent age to the forgiveness of sins? Cyprian in the above quotation does not speak of original sin being forgiven in infant baptism. It refers to the

early opinion that salvation comes through baptism, though Christian unbaptised children would not be condemned for lack of it (49). Gregory Nazianzen (50), holds that unbaptised children do not indeed obtain salvation because they are not baptised though they cannot be condemned by a righteous judge, because they are innocent, and have rather suffered the loss of baptism than caused it. Ambrose thinks a middle state a still undecided question (51). Chrysostom says : "We also baptise children, though they have no sin, that they may have holiness, righteousness, adoption as children, heirship, fraternity with Christ, and may also become his members (52). The damnation of unbaptised heathen was expressly denied by Justin Martyr and Clement of Alexandria.

7. *The Fathers on Original Sin.*—The next subject of interest is that of original sin and infant damnation.

Clement of Alexandria says : "Let them tell us where did the infant just born commit fornication? Or how did he who has committed no wrong fall under the curse of Adam (53)?" Gregory of Nyssa, in speaking of punishment after death says : "But in the case of infants prematurely dying, there is nothing of that sort ; but they pass to that blessed lot at once. The innocent babe has no such plague before its soul's eyes obscuring its measure of light, and so it continues to exist in that natural life ; it does not need the soundness that comes from purgation because it never admitted the plague into its soul at all. But the soul that has never felt the taste of virtue while indeed it may remain perfectly free from the sufferings which flow from wickedness, having never caught the disease of evil at all, does nevertheless in the first instance partake only so far in that life beyond (which consists—in the knowing and in the being in God) as this nursling can receive. The child free from all sin finds itself in the natural state and needs no purification for its health because it as yet has fallen into no disease of the soul (54)." "But we do bring back by royal grace him who bears the scars of sin and has grown old in evil habits to the innocence of the babe. For as the child new-born is free from accusations and penalties so too the child of regeneration has nothing for which to answer, being released by royal bounty from accountability (55)." Gregory Nazianzen assumes the same opinions concerning the innocence of infants in the following remarks on the subject of baptism. If he had believed in the actual original guilt of infants, subjecting them to the danger of eternal damnation, he could not have written as follows : "What have you to say about those who are still children and conscious neither of the loss nor of the grace? Are we to baptise them too? Certainly, if any danger presses. For it is better that they should be unconsciously sanctified than that they should depart unsealed and uninitiated. But in respect of others I give my advice to wait until the end of the third year, or a little more or less, when they may be able to listen or to answer something about the sacrament ; that, even though they

do not perfectly understand it, yet at any rate they may know the outlines. But not yet perhaps is there formed upon your soul any writing good or bad ; and you want to be written upon to-day, and formed by us into perfection (56)." Athanasius speaks of the human soul in its natural state : " So purity of soul is sufficient of itself to reflect God (57)." Clement of Alexandria is very clear that only voluntary sins can be worthy of punishment, although sexual weakness must be amended, and thus be in a very slight degree punishable (58).

Was Adam's sin imputed to all his descendants? The passages most favorable to this supposition require nothing more than that the descendants of Adam shared in the punishment of his sin, not in its guilt (59). Cyril of Jerusalem says expressly : " Paul has given this in order to teach that although Moses was a righteous and wonderful man, yet the sentence of death denounced against Adam, came upon him and upon those who followed him. They did not however sin like Adam, and by disobedience eat of the tree in Paradise." Chrysostom in the passage mentioned above says " Adam began the debt, and we have increased the loan by subsequent sins (60)." Even Ambrose thus explains himself : " We all die in Adam, i. e., like Adam, because by one man sin came into the world, and death by sin and so death has passed through to all men." Thus according to Ambrose the punishment of death is alone that which we have all inherited from Adam. Athenagoras (61) says : " Man is in a good state, both in respect to his creator and also in respect to his natural generation." Clement of Alexandria applies the passage from Job " No one is pure (62)," and Ps. LI, to adults and not to infants. He distinctly limits all sin to voluntary sin (63).

Cyril of Jerusalem says : " There is nothing defiled in the human formation if it does not defile itself by adultery and excess." Here the defilement of man is attributed to voluntary lust, and therefore this implies an individual fall. Clement of Alexandria says : " The first motions after generation (64), are sinful ;" that is, the slightest exercise of the sexual function beyond what is necessary for procreation, is sinful. Gregory of Nyssa says : " Since by the free exercise of will, we have drawn on ourselves a participation in the evil, since we have, along with a kind of pleasure, brought into our nature, as it were a poison mingled with honey, we have thereby fallen from that blessedness which consisted in the absence of passion, and have been changed for the worse (65)."

Athanasius says (66), " there have been many holy men who were pure from all sin. Thus Jeremiah was holy from his birth ; and John, while yet in his mother's womb, leaped for joy at the voice of Mary the mother of our Lord. Nevertheless, death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over those who had not sinned like Adam himself." Chrysostom says (67) that it is an absurdity to hold that by Adam's disobedience anybody else should be a sinner, for no one can deserve punishment who is

not of himself a sinner. According to Justin Martyr, or the author of the *Dial. c. Trypho*, the race of mankind are subjected to death and the deceit of the serpent, the devil ; but sin is by Justin always placed in man's absolute free-will. As Justin held the Gnostic conception of the sinfulness of generation, and as Jesus was supposed by him to have been born without this evil lust, therefore it was possible for him to be the only sinless man. Origen speaks (68) of the impurity of birth, and that probably no one is without sin ; yet this does not mean original sin because Origen believed that souls were incarnated as punishment for sins committed in a pre-existent state.

Athanasius asserts (69) that the "propagation" of sin is an error of Marcion and Manes. He thus distinctly condemns the propagation of original sin. Gregory Nazianzen, believes this circumcision is spiritual, not corporeal (70). "For some seem circumcised by nature, i. e., inclined to good ; others are purified by instruction, because it circumcises as it were their passions, teaches them to distinguish good from evil, and thus produces spiritual wholeness ; others circumcise themselves, who practice virtue without a teacher, spontaneously blow the spark of virtue, and acquire such a habit of virtue that it is almost impossible they should turn to vice." Gregory of Nyssa declares that the soul, since it is created by God, is not necessarily evil, but either it closes its eyes to good of its free choice, or is blinded by the devices of the enemy of our souls, or simply looks at the light of truth, and keeps aloof from dark passions (71).

The cause of the sins committed by Adam's posterity is, according to Greek Fathers before Methodius, the serpent, and the natural sensuality of man. See Athenagoras (72). This is evidently nothing else than lust. Irenaeus sees it in abuse of freedom and negligence, nobody being good or bad by nature (73), the power of the devil is broken by Christ (74). Tertullian and Ambrose consider that sin is propagated by generation, as vitiosity of the soul (75).

8. The Fathers on Predestination and Redemption.—This review of Patristic opinion will close fitly with a consideration of the latter questions of Augustine's discussions, Predestination, and Redemption.

Justin Martyr believes that the salvation of men is based on God's foreknowledge that they will repent (76). Likewise Irenaeus (77), Clement of Al. (78) and Chrysostom (79). Here he speaks of "election according to foreknowledge." Likewise Jerome (80).

Tertullian believes that God elects him who does well, and conversely (81). Hilary says : "Election is not the cause of an unconditional decision, but the election is made according to merit (82)." Ambrose says (83). "God did not predestinate because he foreknew, but he predestinated the rewards of those whose merits he foreknew." He believes that God calls or elects all (84). The following abstract of the opinion of the Fathers or the effects of Christ's death is Münscher's.

Irenaeus (85) and Origen (86) represent the effects of Christ's death as a ransom given to the devil and sometimes as a debt paid to God. The power of the devil was taken from him because he misused it on Jesus Christ (87).

Redemption was a combat (88) or bargain (89) with the devil.

Gregory of Nyssa rejects the idea of the ransom to the devil (90). Athanasius (91) and Cyril (92) look upon it as a debt paid to God—the stipulated condition on which God can without injury to his veracity release men from death threatened to them. Jesus paid more than was necessary (93). Others thought the whole mass of human nature was ennobled by the Son of God's participation in it (94). It was doubtful whether Christ's death was indispensable in order to the salvation of men (95). As to the extent of redemption Origen (96) advanced the idea that Christ died not merely for men, but for all intelligent creatures ; this was rejected by all except perhaps Gregory of Nyssa (97) and Didymus (98).

CHAPTER XV.

THE ATONEMENT ACCORDING TO ATHANASIUS.

1. *Interdependence of Total Depravity and Vicariousness.*—Anselm's view of the Atonement was a logical deduction from total depravity. This point may be proved more clearly by demonstrating that if the wholly vicarious theory of the Atonement be given as a premiss, a logical process of reasoning will conclude to some form of total depravity. Thus might well be shown the absolute dependence of a merely vicarious theory of salvation on a false estimate of human nature.

2. *Athanasius's View of the Atonement.*—In order to carry out the logical process outlined above it may be interesting to follow the ratiocination of the great Athanasius.

The first step of Athanasius was to reassert the existence of such a cosmic reality as a Logos, which some ignorant people had denied. He gives the usual arguments without any material alteration (1). Through the Logos God creates man, and endows him with free will to good and evil (2). Man of his own free will turned to corruption (3), and as thus God's work was being ruined (4) it appeared that the natural means to lead man to God were no more sure, experience having shown that most men had rejected them (5).

The original dispensation was an arbitrary law which could not be altered or amended (6) because what God says cannot prove false (7). Thus death had gained a legal hold on man (8).

But God would not let his creation die, from the motive that it was not worthy of his own goodness that this should happen (9). Rather might it have been supposed that he would have done this out of compassion for the poor doomed creatures which did not possess sufficient powers to attain that for which they had originally been designed. In any case, Athanasius represents God in a rather undignified position, as being in a dilemma. "What possible course was God to take (10)?" "What then was God to do (11)?" Athanasius decides that, from the definition of the word "creature," it is impossible for one of them to satisfy the debts of another. This being so (12), there is of course nothing left for God to do but to send his Logos to take upon himself a human body (13), the Logos being "begotten," not "created." Athanasius does not attempt to show why being "begotten" would enable a person to satisfy the debts of another any more than one who was "created."

In cutting this knot, Athanasius leaves harder knots unloosed,

as he himself realizes. How is it possible for the Logos to remain the cosmical life-principle, and yet be exclusively united with one particular human body? Athanasius himself raises this difficulty, so that it may claim some importance. Athanasius gives it up in despair, acknowledging he cannot explain. He calls it "wonderful (14)."

The ground is now cleared for a detailed account of the manner in which the Logos, after having been "created" man, saves the human race. Athanasius has no clear, consistent explanation of this. Each time he attacks the problem, he gives a different solution, mingling them at times without any apparent realization that they are in many respects inconsistent one with another. It is necessary to separate them carefully, in order to grasp their full significance.

3. *Athanasius's First Theory.*—When Athanasius meets the problem of salvation for the first time, he represents death as an independent opposing power, which had acquired certain legal rights over the human creature. Its power was so great that it succeeded in overcoming every human body with which it measured its fatal strength. Accustomed to conquer, it tried its power on the body of Jesus. It did its best but having used all its strength on it, it failed, and died in the attempt. It might be likened, begging Athanasius's pardon, to a boa constrictor who was in the habit of strangling anything and everything in the shape of a living creature, with marked success, but who one day embraced the iron statue of a dog, and in the futile attempt to strangle it broke itself in two. Death was, "once for all, done away (15)." "And as like when a great king has entered into some large city, and taken up his abode in one of the houses there, such city is at all events held worthy of high honor, 'nor does any enemy or bandit any longer descend upon it and subject it ; but, on the contrary, it is thought entitled to all care, because of the king's having taken up his residence in a single house there ; so too has it been with the monarch of all. For now that he has come to our realm and taken up his abode in one body among his peers, henceforth the whole conspiracy of the enemy against mankind is checked and the corruption of death which before was prevailing against them is done away (16)."

This theory is repeated in other passages in almost the same words and phrases (17).

Athanasius little realized the serious consequences of such a view. In the first place, if it was a true representation of the state of affairs, the least reflection would show that after death had died in the attempt to overcome Jesus's body, it could no longer injure any other human being, for all eternity, wholly irrespective of morality, race, or condition. Men would, after the time of Jesus, have been able to sin with impunity, without dying—which experience has shown to be not true. Nobody could have died, even if he had tried, since death itself was dead. In the second place, such a theory has no connection with mor-

ality—either the morality of those who before Jesus were overcome by death, or those who after Jesus went free to eternal life because death was dead and could not kill them. In the third place, the death of death would have taken place not out of any moral consideration, but simply because the body of the Logos was too tough to be strangled. All these are serious difficulties.

4. *Athanasius's Second Theory.*—In other places, Athanasius represents the satisfaction given by Jesus as a legal transaction, an equivalent. Even this view permits all men soever, of whatever race or morality to reap the benefits of the death of Christ as a natural phenomenon (18). Morally, this theory might be questioned. The only motive of the tender Father in Heaven seems to be vengeance, legal satisfaction. As long as his claim is satisfied, he cares not who pays it, the innocent or the guilty. Nor would this fact be modified by the consideration that it was he himself who sent or allowed the Logos, the innocent, to suffer for the guilty, for it still represents him as being more determined on vengeance than on its remitment. This view of course assumes that God himself is subject to legal restriction, which, consequently, must be above and beyond him. But this is unthinkable.

5. *Athanasius's Third Theory.*—The third view holds that Jesus paid to God a debt which man owed him (19). Athanasius does not explain how man incurred this financial debt, or how it was repaid. This theory, quite as much as the former ones, frees man from the restrictions of morality and personal responsibility (20), or even knowledge of the fact that Jesus died.

6. *Limitation of Salvation.*—Although in the above theories of salvation, Athanasius extends the results to all men, this is not his opinion always. When he is led, not by his logic, but by his scriptural education, he repeats the scriptural phrases that it depends on belief in Jesus (21). He does not appear to realize this serious inconsistency.

7. *Human Depravity.*—Athanasius commits, however, another inconsistency. Whereas in the formal schemes of salvation detailed above he stated, as the reason why an Incarnation was needed, that man was becoming ruined, it is capable of proof that he was led to this only "ex post facto," because he needed a need for the incarnation. Not only in his oration against the heathen, but also in his formal work on the incarnation, does he show that all men still possess free will and natural means of reaching out unto a knowledge of God.

"For not being willing to leave her lusts, she" the soul "fears death, and the separation from the body." Therefore the soul does not commit evil necessarily, but because she chooses to do so (22).

Sexual lust is the sin which leads to all other sins whatsoever; therefore "purity of soul is sufficient of itself to reflect God (23)." Each soul has a double set of senses: by which God and the

world are revealed. Sexual lust blinds the divine senses ; and in order to see God again, all that is necessary is to cease from lust. “The way of truth will aim at reaching the real and true God. But for its knowledge and accurate comprehension there is need of no other save ourselves. Neither, as God himself is above all, is the road to him afar off or outside ourselves, but it is in us, and it is possible to find it from ourselves—(Deut. XXX : 14, Luke XVII : 12)—And let not the Greeks who worship idols make excuses, nor let any one else simply deceive himself, professing to have no such road, and therefore finding a pretext for his godlessness.—What road is this? I say it is the soul of each one of us, and the intelligence which resides there. For by it alone can God be contemplated and received (24).”—“Or why, in like manner as they have departed from God, do they not betake themselves to him again? For they are able, as they turned away their understanding from God,—in like manner to ascend with the intelligence of their soul and turn back to God again.—Whence also, when it gets rid of all the filth of sin which covers it and retains only the likeness of the image in its purity, then surely this latter being brightened, the soul beholds as in a mirror the image of the Father, even the word, and by his means reaches the idea of the Father whose image the Saviour is (25).” There are very many like passages (26).

But these are not the only chances of salvation for souls. By contemplation of the works of nature, and by reasoning by analogy from them up to God every soul is able to conclude back to the nature of God (27). Or by the teachings of good men (28) or by simply refraining from lawlessness (29), or by the mere method of fasting (30), men could have come to the knowledge of God, and to the purity implied in this.

Athanasius considered Jesus a “teacher (31)” or “ensample (32)” in respect to his actual influence on human salvation. His miracles proved to man his veridicity in teaching (33) ; and thus he is “the way which leads us back to God (34).”

When Athanasius uses scriptural language, he says that Jesus was incarnate “for our sake (35),” “for our salvation (36),” and that “we become God by partaking of the body of the word (37).” The two former expressions are tolerably scriptural, and should be interpreted as such. There is grave doubt, however, whether the third refers to the Holy Communion. From another passage (38) it seems probable that by it is meant only a mental act of worship, since the Logos is Universal reason, and his body is thought. Be this as it may, it appears that Athanasius, when he did not use scriptural language, and permitted himself to construct theories verged either towards natural religion or views which it is impossible to feel perfectly satisfied with.

CHAPTER XVI.

THE SOTERIOLOGY OF ORIGEN.

1. *Origen's System.*—It has been so far evident that when the Fathers departed from strictly scriptural language, they involved themselves into exceedingly questionable speculations. The system of Origen will appear an extreme case, in spite of its peculiar beauty.

2. *The Freedom of the Will.*—Origen was thoroughly convinced of the freedom of the human will, and sufficiently philosophical not to involve himself in such dire contradictions on the subject, as Athanasius, and the later theologians. To a discussion of this topic he devotes the whole fourth book of his treatise on Basic Principles. The feeling of responsibility and guilt proved that man was free to choose an upward or a downward course. This implied that merit accrued to him who chose to do the right ; and if man can merit anything, God must be just to him, rewarding and punishing him exactly in accordance with his deserts.

Punishment, without opportunity of amendment is vindictiveness ; and a God who is just cannot be vindictive. Consequently all punishment is sanative, or purgative. So thought Gregory Nazianzen also.

If man can merit anything, then it is plain there is no need of a mediator between God and man in the moral life ; the metaphysical mediation of the Logos being a cosmological fact which has no relation to the divine union of God and man.

3. *Human Perfectibility.*—God is just ; he distributes to all according to their merits (1). The beginning of evil is sloth (2) which ends in sexual lust (3), from which all souls must free themselves before they can become better (4). These sins are the fuel and fire of punishment (5) which is always purgative (6). Consequently, even the devil and his angels could be saved if they desired to look up (7) and without saying anything as to whether they would be saved or not Origen looked forward to the time when all opposing powers would be turned into obedient powers, and thus at the last, when even Jesus Christ would be subordinated to God, he would be all in all (8). This is a sublime belief, and a most glorious hope.

In no case has the soul gone so far that the power to become better is lost (9) yet the guarding angel of God (10) may be taken away from it, when the soul becomes "lost" in the mazes of the Universe (11) ;—but "We think indeed that the goodness of God, through his Christ, may recall all his creatures to one end, even his enemies being conquered and subdued (12)."

All were originally equal, and spoke one universal language while dwelling in the "East" before they fell (13) according to their free will (14), rising or falling exactly in accordance

with their merits (15). These merits may be earned either or both by works and knowledge, those who have done works but not having enough knowledge being placed by God after each incarnation where the requisite knowledge may be gotten (16).

4. *Life Beyond may Explain Difficulties of this Life.*—In the space of a single life God's ways with souls appear unjust ; but as God is just, there must be more than one life, in which other lives all inequalities are accounted for satisfactorily (17). Long ages may be needed for this (18), and much time may be spent between incarnations (19).

But perhaps the duration or conditions of this world may not suffice to allow for perfect development for all souls, so that other worlds will be provided for those souls who need them (20).

All things have souls (21) ; this was nothing but Stoic doctrine. Consequently, the earth and the stars also have souls (22). The purpose of these worlds is to give souls opportunities for development, "for the manifestation of the Sons of God (23)." Thus the whole universe is one organism (24).

Souls ascend and descend from sphere to sphere all through the universe according to their merits (25). As the spirits become purer and purer, the bodies they inhabit become ever more spiritual and pure and incorporeal, till "the earth and heavens" are renewed (26). Souls return again to trial at times after they have done all that is necessary to do good to those who are less developed in the world (27) as the prophets of old may have done. By these works of supererogation, the possibility of sinning is so worked out that souls may become as fixed in good as God is.

Yet this process of sanctification is not one of increased positivity. On the contrary : the more merit a soul has, the more it becomes receptive to the divine (29). Consequently, the end of the whole process of sanctification is to become God by being lost in him : when the Father alone, shall be all in all (30).

5. *Justice and Love are United in Jesus.*—In this coherent scheme, the divine justice and love is so perfect, that there is no division between God and his world large enough to admit of a mediator, even if such an one were necessary.

Who was Jesus? His soul had been equal to any other at the start (31) and because he was the best man he became most receptive to the divine spirit and was united to the divine (32), having alone merited it (33). He saved man by teaching him true doctrine (34) and by conferring on man the power to impart the Holy Ghost in a higher degree but not in different kind from the Holy Spirit of the Hebrew prophets (35).

Man being composed of body, soul and spirit (36), the soul of Jesus formed the mediating link between the body and the divinity, and by utter yielding to the Logos became one with it. Jesus had acquired the impossibility of sinning by the merit of his intense love in former incarnations (37) and had thus become worthy of the divine. Since his soul is utterly lost in the

Logos and God, everything that he does, feels and knows is God (38).

We notice here an inconsistency. Jesus is united to the Logos because he is worthy of union with it. But if possibility of equal merit attaches to all, how is it that of all past, present and future souls that of Jesus is the best? Is this not injustice to the others, since only one can be united to the Logos?

6. *Origen Held no Total Depravity.*—In reviewing the Soteriology of Origen, we do not see a trace of human incurable depravity, or of a mediation of vicarious Atonement. Had Origen, whom Athanasius calls "the learned," ever heard of one?

It is worth noticing, also, how unformed, in the days of Origen, must have been the dogma of Christ's person on earth. What we have just read is in every particular, almost, heretical; and yet during his life Origen was considered the greatest of Christian teachers, filling perhaps the most important post in Christendom, with the exception of a Patriarchate. The troubles which drove him from Alexandria had nothing to do with his dogmas; and among his fervent adherents were the most enlightened Bishops in Palestine and Syria. In his day, therefore, his doctrine cannot have been regarded as uncommon or heretical, whatever may have been the opinion of those who followed after him. Did the traditional doctrine of Christ's personality exist in the days of Origen? To say that Origen is heretical is only to confess that the traditional doctrine seems to have been ignored in the days of Origen.

7. *The Atonement.*—The great idea of the Soteriology of Origen, as also of the original one of Athanasius, was the reconciling of man to God, and not the reconciling of God to man, as was the case with the speculations of Anselm. In harmony with this early conception of reconciling man to God, the part which Christ plays in our salvation is very different. True, the symbolic language of the Old Testament, early gave a sacrificial interpretation to such texts as "the lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world." Yet Origen, and after him the two great Gregories, Ambrose and Augustine conceived that the Christ had deceived and outwitted the devil, by performing marvels so that the devil thought he was worth more than all the rest of humanity, and agreed to give up his legal claim to humanity for Christ's body, which however broke the bands of death (39).

But in spite of sacrificial language, he compared the death of Christ to that of heroes of the ancient times (40), and conversely ascribing effects of the same kind, if not in the same degree, to the deaths of martyrs (41). It is quite sure therefore that he had no idea of Anselm's doctrine of vicarious Atonement, especially since the purpose was not to reconcile God to man, but man to God (42): for good works were alone needed to accomplish this and merit cannot be transferred. But since Jesus is united to the cosmical Logos, his death is of value to all worlds and all times (43).

CHAPTER XVII.

THE SOTERIOLOGY OF THE FATHERS PRIOR TO ORIGEN.

1. *The Soteriology of Clement of Alexandria.*—The Soteriology of the Fathers before Origen is very meagre : being mainly expressed in scriptural phrases, and consequently being interpretable in the same manner.

Clement of Alexandria interpreted the verse : “the lamb of God who taketh away the sin of the world” a lamb merely as to innocence (1). He has no answer to the question, why was it necessary for Jesus to be incarnated? He speaks of the death of Christ in the scriptural term of the “propitiation” without defining it any further (2). The scriptural term “ransom” is used without explanation (3). We must not look to the crucified, but to the risen Saviour. Forgiveness is limited to sins actually committed before baptism (4). How far Clement is from vicariousness may be seen in such expressions as the following : “Each of us justifies himself (5),” “The true gnostic creates himself (6).” “Men may choose to believe or disbelieve (7).” His strong views on freewill, and of the individuality of the fall in each, given elsewhere, will corroborate this position. Also, we have given elsewhere his agreement with Origen in the matter of considering the death of Christ as like in kind with that of Martyrs and heroes. Jesus was the Teacher, Shepherd, Healer, Pattern, rather than the vicarious Atoner. We need not scruple to say that nowhere before the time of Athanasius was a vicarious conception of Christ held. And yet this is of the very essence of the traditional dogma, since it is the only theory by which utterly helpless creatures can be saved. Clement, like Philo and Origen, applied the high-priest-hood of Christ to the mediatorial office of the cosmological Logos, without any reference to the death of Jesus, and yet speaks of the efficacy of the blood of Christ, the crown of thorns, etc. As to the nature of Jesus of Nazara’s person, Clement was quite as much in the dark as Origen : the body of Jesus was not subject to the same necessities as other bodies, and when on the cross, Jesus felt no pain (8). All these uncertain expressions show that Clement publicly taught no dogma such as the later one, in which the human and divine natures were scrupulously defined. Faith however was not only the key to the knowledge of God, but also that by which we are made children of God (9). It is not clear whether this means faith in the redeemer and his death. Other Fathers cotemporary with or preceding Clement are

hardly more definite. Justin Martyr looks on Jesus as a teacher, saving men by his doctrine ; Irenaeus considers him a pattern for all humanity. Justin says that Jesus "taught these doctrines for the renewal and restoration of mankind (10)." He speaks of Jesus as a sacrifice, suffering for the good of humanity (11). These Fathers insisted, however, strenuously on the moral aspect of salvation. Repentance demanded good works in order to be accounted genuine, the external appearance of tears being sometimes insisted on. Whether all this was connected with the atonement of Jesus does not appear (12). For Origen had enumerated seven means of remissions of sins : first, by baptism ; second, by martyrdom ; then, by alms, forgiveness of the sins of others, the conversion of others, great love, and penance (13).

2. *Old Testament Symbology.*—The earlier the student looks, the more he finds the utterances of the Fathers scriptural, and the more indefinite, in respect to independent theories. A crucial instance of this is the general uncertainty as to the recipient of the "ransom" for man. Even till the days of Gregory of Nyssa, it remained an open question whether the ransom for man, which was the life and death of Jesus, was given to the devil or to God. The earlier Fathers held generally to the former supposition ; the later Fathers to the latter. Evidently the whole conception of a ransom was but a late adaptation from the symbology of the Old Testament, pointing to times when the Scriptures were alone looked to as authoritative expressions on the subject. This period of Old Testament interpretation of the New followed immediately on the apostolic or New Testament times. It was then that, for instance, the Christians who were endeavoring to convert the Jews introduced into Christianity the word "altar," which had before been so carefully excluded in earlier days, when every Christian was called a royal priest, and the Church officers nothing more than "elders" or "apostles." As a matter of fact, in the New Testament the word meaning "priest (14)" (such as the priests of the Old Dispensation were) is distinctly and emphatically applied to all Christians soever, and in no one single instance to the apostles, presbyters, or deacons exclusively—all of whom were called "presbyters" from the Greek word (15) meaning "elder." John, when writing to lay Christians, speaks of himself only as of an "elder" (16), and Peter, as of a "fellow-elder." (17). On the contrary, Jesus is called a "high-priest (18)."

CHAPTER XVIII.

THE SOTERIOLOGY OF THE PAULINE WRITINGS.

1. *Summary.*—Summarizing the Soteriology of the Pauline writings, it appears that by his death on earth Christ effected a reconciliation varyingly described as of man to God, and again as from God to man. By his resurrected life, he imparts his Spirit to believers by which they amend their lives, and thus attain salvation.

Morality is however in contradiction to this vital relation, and is at times represented only as an inference from the work of Christ. In fact, good works seem to be only a desirable addition to salvation. "This is a faithful saying, and these things I will that thou affirm constantly, that they which have believed in God might be careful to maintain good works. These things are good and profitable unto men." Titus, III : 8. This language could not have been used if Morality had been of the essence of Soteriology, or "belief in God."

2. *Romans.*—

Romans I : 16-32.

For I am not ashamed of the gospel : for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth ; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek. For therein is revealed a righteousness of God by faith unto faith : as it is written, But the righteous shall live by faith.

For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who hold down the truth in unrighteousness ; because that which may be known of God is manifest in them ; for God manifested it unto them. For the invisible things of him since the creation of the world are clearly seen, being perceived through the things that are made, even his everlasting power and divinity ; that they may be without excuse : because that, knowing God, they glorified him not as God, neither gave thanks ; but became vain in their reasonings, and their senseless heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the incorruptible God for the likeness of an image of corruptible man, and of birds, and fourfooted beasts, and creeping things.

Wherefore God gave them up in the lusts of their hearts unto uncleanness, that their bodies should be dishonoured among themselves : for that they exchanged the truth of God for a lie, and worshipped and served the creature rather than the Creator, who is blessed for ever. Amen.

For this cause God gave them up unto vile passions : for their women changed the natural use into that which is against nature : and likewise also the men, leaving the natural use of the woman, burned in their lust one toward another, men with men working unseemliness, and receiving in themselves that recompence of their error which was due.

And even as they refused to have God in their knowledge, God gave them up unto a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not fitting ; being filled with all unrighteousness, wickedness, covetousness, malice ; full of envy, murder, strife, deceit, malignity ; whisperers, backbiters, hateful to God, insolent, haughty, boastful, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, without understanding, covenant breakers without natural affection, unmerciful : who, knowing the ordinance of God, that they which practise such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but also consent with them that practise them.

Romans II : 5-15.

But after thy hardness and impenitent heart treasures up for thyself wrath in the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgement of God ; who will render to every man according to his works : to them that by patience in well-doing seek for glory and honour and incorruption, eternal life : but unto them that are factious, and obey not the truth, but obey unrighteousness, shall be wrath and indignation, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that worketh evil, of the Jew first, and also of the Greek ; but glory and honour and peace to every man that worketh good, to the Jew first, and also to the Greek : for there is no respect of persons with God. For as many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law : and as many as have sinned under law shall be judged by law ; for not the hearers of a law are just before God but the doers of law shall be justified : for when Gentiles which have no law do by nature the things of the law, these, having no law, are a law unto themselves ; in that they shew the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience bearing witness therewith, and their thoughts one with another accusing or else excusing them.

Romans III : 19-31.

Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it speaketh to them that are under the law ; that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may be brought under the judgment of God : because by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified in his sight : for through the law cometh the knowledge of sin. But now apart from the law a righteousness of God hath been manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets ; even the righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ unto all them that believe ; for there is no distinction ; for all have sinned, and fall short of the glory of God ; being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus : whom God set forth to be a propitiation, through faith, by his blood, to shew his righteousness, because of the passing over of the sins done aforetime, in the forbearance of God ; for the shewing, I say, of his righteousness at this present season : that he might himself be just, and the Justifier of him that hath faith in Jesus. Where then is the glorying? It is excluded. By what manner of law? of works? Nay : but by a law of faith. We reckon therefore that a man is justified by faith apart from the works of the law. Or is God the God of Jews only? Is he not the God of Gentiles also? Yea, of Gentiles also : if so be that God is one, and he shall justify the circumcision by faith, and the uncircumcision through faith. Do we then make the law of none effect through faith? God forbid : nay, we establish the law.

Romans IV : 1-25.

What then shall we say that Abraham, our forefather according to the flesh, hath found? For if Abraham was justified by works, he hath whereof to glory ; but not toward God. For what saith the scripture? And Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned unto him for righteousness. Now to him that worketh, the reward is not reckoned as of grace, but as of debt. But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is reckoned for righteousness. Even as David also pronounceth blessing upon the man, unto whom God reckoneth righteousness apart from works, saying,

Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven,
And whose sins are covered.

Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not reckon sin. Is this blessing then pronounced upon the circumcision, or upon the uncircumcision also? for we say, To Abraham his faith was reckoned for righteousness. How then was it reckoned? when he was in circumcision, or in uncircumcision? Not in circumcision, but in uncircumcision : and he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had while he was in uncircum-

cision : that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be in uncircumcision, that righteousness might be reckoned unto them; and the father of circumcision to them who not only are of the circumcision, but who also walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham which he had in uncircumcision. For not through the law was the promise to Abraham or to his seed, that he should be heir of the world, but through the righteousness of faith. For if they which are of the law be heirs, faith is made void, and the promise is made of none effect : for the law worketh wrath ; but where there is no law, neither is there transgression. For this cause it is of faith, that it may be according to grace ; to the end that the promise may be sure to all the seed ; not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham, who is the father of us all (as it is written, *A father of many nations have I made thee*) before him whom he believed even God, who quickeneth the dead, and calleth things that are not, as though they were. Who in hope believed against hope, to the end that he might become a father of many nations, according to that which had been spoken, *So shall thy seed be*. And without being weakened in faith he considered his own body now as good as dead (he being about a hundred years old), and the deadness of Sarah's womb : yea, looking unto the promise of God, he wavered not through unbelief, but waxed strong through faith, giving glory to God, and being fully assured that, what he had promised, he was able also to perform. Wherefore also it was reckoned unto him for righteousness. Now it was not written for his sake alone, that it was reckoned unto him ; but for our sake also unto whom it shall be reckoned, who believe on him that raised Jesus our Lord from the dead, who was delivered up for our trespasses, and was raised for our justification.

Romans V : 1-21.

Being therefore justified by faith, let us have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ ; through whom also we have had our access by faith into this grace wherein we stand ; and let us rejoice in hope of the glory of God. And not only so, but let us also rejoice in our tribulations : knowing that tribulation worketh patience ; and patience, probation ; and probation, hope : and hope putteth not to shame ; because the love of God hath been shed abroad in our hearts through the Holy Ghost which was given unto us. For while we were yet weak, in due season Christ died for the ungodly. For scarcely for a righteous man will one die : for peradventure for the good man some one would even dare to die. But God commendeth his own love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. Much more then, being now justified by his blood, shall we be saved from the wrath of God through him. For if, while we were enemies, we were reconciled to God through the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, shall we be saved by his life : and not only so, but we also rejoice in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom we have now received the reconciliation.

Therefore, as through one man sin entered into the world, and death through sin ; and so death passed unto all men, for that all sinned :— for until the law sin was in the world : but sin is not imputed when there is no law. Nevertheless death reigned from Adam until Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the likeness of Adam's transgression, who is a figure of him that was to come. But not as the trespass, so also is the free gift. For if by the trespass of the one the many died, much more did the grace of God, and the gift by the grace of the one man, Jesus Christ, abound unto the many. And not as through one that sinned, so is the gift : for the judgement came of one unto condemnation, but the free gift came of many trespasses unto justification. For if, by the trespass of the one, death reigned through the one ; much more shall they that receive the abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness reign in life through the one, even Jesus Christ. So then as through one trespass the judgement came unto all men to condemnation ; even so through one act of righteousness the free gift came unto all men to justification of life. For as through the one man's disobedience the many

were made sinners, even so through the obedience of the one shall the many be made righteous. And the law came in beside, that the trespass might abound ; but where sin abounded, grace did abound more exceedingly : that, as sin reigned in death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.

Romans VI : 1-23

What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound? God forbid. We who died to sin, how shall we any longer live therein? Or are ye ignorant that all we who were baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into his death? We were buried therefore with him through baptism into death : that like as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we also might walk in newness of life. For if we have become united with him by the likeness of his death, we shall be also by the likeness of his resurrection ; knowing this, that our old man was crucified with him, that the body of sin might be done away, that so we should no longer be in bondage to sin ; for he that hath died is justified from sin. But if we died with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him ; knowing that Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more ; death no more hath dominion over him. For the death that he died, he died unto sin once : but the life that he liveth, he liveth unto God. Even so reckon ye also yourselves to be dead unto sin, but alive unto God in Christ Jesus.

Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey the lusts thereof : neither present your members unto sin as instruments of unrighteousness ; but present yourselves unto God, as alive from the dead, and your members as instruments of righteousness unto God. For sin shall not have dominion over you : for ye are not under law, but under grace.

What then? shall we sin, because we are not under law, but under grace? God forbid. Know ye not, that to whom ye present yourselves as servants unto obedience his servants ye are whom ye obey : whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness? But thanks be to God, that, whereas ye were servants of sin, ye became obedient from the heart to that form of teaching whereunto ye were delivered ; and being made free from sin, ye became servants of righteousness. I speak after the manner of men because of the infirmity of your flesh : for as ye presented your members as servants to uncleanness and to iniquity unto iniquity, even so now present your members as servants to righteousness unto sanctification. For when ye were servants of sin, ye were free in regard of righteousness. What fruit then had ye at that time in the things whereof ye are now ashamed? for the end of those things is death. But now being made free from sin, and become servants to God, ye have your fruit unto sanctification, and the end eternal life. For the wages of sin is death ; but the free gift of God is eternal life in Christ Jesus our Lord.

Romans VII : 1-25

Or are ye ignorant, brethren (for I speak to men that know the law), how that the law hath dominion over a man for so long time as he liveth? For the woman that hath a husband is bound by law to the husband while he liveth ; but if the husband die, she is discharged from the law of the husband. So then if, while the husband liveth, she be joined to another man, she shall be called an adulteress : but if the husband die, she is free from the law, so that she is no adulteress, though she be joined to another man. Wherefore, my brethren, ye also were made dead to the law through the body of Christ ; that ye should be joined to another, even to him who was raised from the dead, that we might bring forth fruit unto God. For when we were in the flesh, the sinful passions, which were through the law, wrought in our members to bring forth fruit unto death. But now we have been discharged from the law, having died to that wherein we were holden ; so that we serve in newness of the spirit, and not in oldness of the letter.

What shall we say then? Is the law sin? God forbid. Howbeit, I had not known sin, except through the law : for I had not known

coveting, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet: but sin, finding occasion, wrought in me through the commandment all manner of coveting: for apart from the law sin is dead. And I was alive apart from the law once: but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died; and the commandment, which was unto life, this I found to be unto death: for sin, finding occasion, through the commandment beguiled me, and through it slew me. So that the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and righteous, and good. Did then that which is good become death unto me? God forbid. But sin, that it might be shewn to be sin, by working death to me through that which is good:—that through the commandment sin might become exceeding sinful. For we know that the law is spiritual: but I am carnal, sold under sin. For that which I do I know not: for not what I would, that do I practise: but what I hate, that I do. But if what I would not, that I do, I consent unto the law that it is good. So now it is no more I that do it, but sin which dwelleth in me. For I know that in me, that is, in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing: for to will is present with me, but to do that which is good is not. For the good which I would I do not: but the evil which I would not, that I practise. But if what I would not, that I do, it is no more I that do it, but sin which dwelleth in me. I find then the law, that, to me who would do good, evil is present. For I delight in the law of God after the inward man: but I see a different law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity under the law of sin which is in my members. O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me out of the body of this death? I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord. So then I myself with the mind serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin.

Romans VIII: 1-39.

There is therefore now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus. For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus made me free from the law of sin and of death. For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God, sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh and as an offering for sin, condemned sin in the flesh: that the ordinance of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit. For they that are after the flesh do mind the things of the flesh; but they that are after the spirit the things of the spirit. For the mind of the flesh is death; but the mind of the spirit is life and peace: because the mind of the flesh is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can it be: and they that are in the flesh cannot please God. But ye are not in the flesh, but in the spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you. But if any man hath not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his. And if Christ is in you, the body is dead because of sin; but the spirit is life because of righteousness. But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwelleth in you, he that raised up Christ Jesus from the dead shall quicken also your mortal bodies through his spirit that dwelleth in you.

So then, brethren, we are debtors, not to the flesh, to live after the flesh: for if ye live after the flesh, ye must die; but if by the spirit ye mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live. For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, these are sons of God. For ye received not the spirit of bondage again under fear; but ye received the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father. The Spirit himself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are children of God: and if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with him, that we may be also glorified with him.

For I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed to us-ward. For the earnest expectation of the creation waiteth for the revealing of the sons of God. For the creation was subjected to vanity, not of its own will, but by reason of him who subjected it, in hope that the creation itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the liberty of the glory of the children of

God. For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travalleth in pain together until now. And not only so, but ourselves also, which have the firstfruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves waiting for our adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body. For by hope were we saved: but hope that is seen is not hope: for who hopeth for that which he seeth? But if we hope for that which we see not, then do we with patience wait for it.

And in like manner the Spirit also helpeth our infirmity: for we know not how to pray as we ought; but the Spirit himself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered; and he that searcheth the heart knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because he maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God. And we know that to them that love God all things work together for good, even to them that are called according to his purpose. For whom he foreknew, he also foreordained to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren: and whom he foreordained, them he also called: and whom he called, them he also justified: and whom he justified, then he also glorified.

What then shall we say to these things? If God is for us, who is against us? He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not also with him freely give us all things? Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth; who is he that shall condemn? It is Christ Jesus that died, yea rather, that was raised from the dead, who is at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us. Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? shall tribulation, or anguish, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? Even as it is written,

For thy sake we are killed all the day long;

We were accounted as sheep for the slaughter.

Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through him that loved us. For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor things present, nor things to come, nor powers, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.

Romans X : 1-21.

Brethren, my heart's desire and my supplication to God is for them, that they may be saved. For I bear them witness that they have a zeal for God, but not according to knowledge. For being ignorant of God's righteousness, and seeking to establish their own, they did not subject themselves to the righteousness of God. For Christ is the end of the law unto righteousness to every one that believeth. For Moses writeth that the man that doeth the righteousness which is of the law shall live thereby. But the righteousness which is of faith saith thus, Say not in thy heart, who shall ascend into heaven? (that is, to bring Christ down:) or, Who shall descend into the abyss? (that is to bring Christ up from the dead.) But what saith it? The word is nigh thee, in thy mouth, and in thy heart: that is, the word of faith, which we preach: because if thou shalt confess with thy mouth Jesus as Lord, and shalt believe in thy heart that God raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved: for with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation. For the scripture saith, Whosoever believeth on him shall not be put to shame. For there is no distinction between Jew and Greek: for the same Lord is Lord of all, and is rich unto all that call upon him: for, Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved. How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in him whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher? and how shall they preach, except they be sent? even as it is written, How beautiful are the feet of them that bring glad tidings of good things!

But they did not all hearken to the glad tidings. For Isaiah saith, Lord, who hath believed our report? So belief cometh of hearing, and hearing by the word of Christ. But I say, Did they not hear?

Yea, verily,

Their sound went out into all the earth,
And their words unto the ends of the world.

But I say, Did Israel not know? First Moses saith,
I will provoke you to jealousy with that which is no nation,
With a nation void of understanding will I anger you.

And Isaiah is very bold, and saith

I was found of them that sought me not :

I became manifest unto them that asked not of me.

But as to Israel he saith, All the day long did I spread out my hands unto a disobedient and gainsaying people.

Romans XII: 1-21.

I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, to present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God, which is your reasonable service. And be not fashioned according to this world : but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is the good and acceptable and perfect will of God.

For I say, through the grace that was given me, to every man that is among you, not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think ; but so to think as to think soberly, according as God hath dealt to each man a measure of faith. For even as we have many members in one body and all the members have not the same office : so we, who are many, are one body in Christ, and severally members one of another. And having gifts differing according to the grace that was given to us, whether prophecy, let us prophesy according to the proportion of our faith ; or ministry, let us give ourselves to our ministry ; or he that teacheth, to his teaching ; or he that exhorteth, to his exhorting : he that giveth, let him do it with liberality ; he that ruleth with diligence ; he that sheweth mercy, with cheerfulness. Let love be without hypocrisy. Abhor that which is evil ; cleave to that which is good. In love of the brethren be tenderly affectioned one to another ; in honour preferring one another ; in diligence not slothful ; fervent in spirit ; serving the Lord ; rejoicing in hope ; patient in tribulation ; continuing steadfastly in prayer ; communicating to the necessities of the saints ; given to hospitality. Bless them that persecute you ; bless, and curse not. Rejoice with them that rejoice ; weep with them that weep. Be of the same mind one toward another. Set not your mind on high things, but condescend to things that are lowly. Be not wise in your own conceits. Render to no man evil for evil. Take thought for things honourable in the sight of all men. If it be possible, as much as in you lieth, be at peace with all men. Avenge not yourselves, beloved, but give place unto wrath : for it is written, Vengeance belongeth unto me ; I will recompense, saith the Lord. But if thine enemy hunger, feed him ; if he thirst, give him to drink : for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire upon his head. Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good.

3. *I and II Corinthians.*—

I Cor. I: 23-31.

But we preach Christ crucified, unto Jews a stumblingblock, and unto Gentiles foolishness ; but unto them that are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God. Because the foolishness of God is wiser than men ; and the weakness of God is stronger than men.

For behold your calling, brethren, how that not many wise after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, are called : but God chose the foolish things of the world, that he might put to shame them that are wise ; and God chose the weak things of the world, that he might put to shame the things that are strong ; and the base things of the world, and the things that are despised, did God choose, yea and the things that are not that he might bring to nought the things that are : that no flesh should glory before God. But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who was made unto us wisdom from God, and righteousness and sanctification, and redemption : that, according as it is written, He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord.

I Cor. VI : 9-20.

Or know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with men, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners shall inherit the kingdom of God. And such were some of you: but ye were washed, but ye were sanctified, but ye were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and in the Spirit of our God.

All things are lawful for me; but not all things are expedient. All things are lawful for me; but I will not be brought under the power of any. Meats for the belly, and the belly for meats: but God shall bring to nought both it and them. But the body is not for fornication, but for the Lord; and the Lord for the body: and God both raised the Lord, and will raise up us through his power. Know ye not that your bodies are members of Christ? shall I then take away the members of Christ, and make them members of a harlot? God forbid.

Or know ye not that he that is joined to a harlot is one body? for The twain, saith he, shall become one flesh. But he that is joined unto the Lord is one spirit. Flee fornication. Every sin that a man doeth is without the body; but he that committeth fornication sinneth against his own body. Or know ye not that your body is a temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you, which ye have from God? and ye are not your own; for ye were bought with a price: glorify God therefore in your body.

I Cor. XI : 29-34.

For he that eateth and drinketh eateth and drinketh judgement unto himself, if he discern not the body. For this cause many among you are weak and sickly, and not a few sleep. But if we discerned ourselves, we should not be judged. But when we are judged, we are chastened of the Lord, that we may not be condemned with the world. Wherefore, my brethren, when ye come together to eat, wait one for another. If any man is hungry, let him eat at home; that your coming together be not unto judgement. And the rest will I set in order whensoever I come.

I Cor. XV : 12-28; 57, 58.

Now if Christ is preached that he hath been raised from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead? But if there is no resurrection of the dead, neither hath Christ been raised: and if Christ hath not been raised then is our preaching vain, your faith also is vain. Yea, and we are found false witness of God: because we witnessed of God that he raised up Christ: whom he raised not up, if so be that the dead are not raised. For if the dead are not raised, neither hath Christ been raised: and if Christ hath not been raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins. Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ have perished. If in this life only we have hoped in Christ, we are of all men most pitiable.

But now hath Christ been raised from the dead, the firstfruits of them that are asleep. For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive. But each in his own order: Christ the firstfruits; then they that are Christ's, at his coming. Then cometh the end, when he shall deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have abolished all rule and all authority and power. For he must reign, till he hath put all his enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be abolished is death. For, He put all things in subjection under his feet. But when he saith, All things are put in subjection it is evident that he is excepted who did subiect all things unto him. And when all things have been subiect unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subiect to him that did subiect all things unto him, that God may be all in all.

But thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ. Wherefore, my beloved brethren, be ye stedfast, unmoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labour is not vain in the Lord.

II Cor. V: 18-21.

But all things are of God, who reconciled us to himself through Christ, and gave unto us the ministry of reconciliation ; to wit, that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself not reckoning unto them their trespasses, and having committed unto us the word of reconciliation.

We are ambassadors therefore on behalf of Christ as though God were intreating by us : we beseech you on behalf of Christ, be ye reconciled to God. Him who knew no sin he made to be sin on our behalf ; that we might become the righteousness of God in him.

4. *Galatians.*—

Gal. I: 4.

Who gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us out of this present evil world according to the will of our God and Father.

Gal. II: 15-21.

We being Jews by nature, and not sinners of the Gentiles, yet knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, save through faith in Jesus Christ, even we believed on Christ Jesus, that we might be justified by faith in Christ, and not by the works of the law : because by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified. But if, while we sought to be justified in Christ, we ourselves also were found sinners, is Christ a minister of sin? God forbid. For if I build up again those things which I destroyed, I prove myself a transgressor. For I through the law died unto the law, that I might live unto God. I have been crucified with Christ ; yet I live ; and yet no longer I, but Christ liveth in me : and that life which I now live in the flesh I live in faith, the faith which is in the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself up for me. I do not make void the grace of God : for if righteousness is through the law, then Christ died for nought.

Gal. III: 1-29 ; IV: 4-7.

O foolish Galatians, who did bewitch you, before whose eyes Jesus Christ was openly set forth crucified? This only would I learn from you, Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith? Are ye so foolish? having begun in the Spirit, are ye now perfected in the flesh? Did ye suffer so many things in vain? if it be indeed in vain. He therefore that supplieth to you the Spirit, and worketh miracles among you, doeth he it by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith? Even as Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned unto him for righteousness. Know therefore that they which be of faith, the same are sons of Abraham. And the Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the Gentiles by faith, preached the gospel beforehand unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all the nations be blessed. So then they which be of faith are blessed with the faithful Abraham. For as many as are of the works of the law are under a curse : for it is written, Cursed is every one which continueth not in all things that are written in the book of the law to do them. Now that no man is justified by the law in the sight of God, is evident : for, The righteous shall live by faith ; and the law is not of faith ; but, He that doeth them shall live in them. Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us : for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree : that upon the Gentiles might come the blessing of Abraham in Christ Jesus ; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith.

Brethren, I speak after the manner of men : Though it be but a man's covenant, yet when it hath been confirmed, no one maketh it void or addeth thereto. Now to Abraham were the promises spoken, and to his seed. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many ; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ. Now this I say ; A covenant confirmed beforehand by God, the law, which came four hundred and thirty years after, doth not disannul, so as to make the promise of none effect. For if the inheritance is of the law it is no more of promise : but God hath granted it to Abraham by promise. What

then is the law? It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise hath been made; and it was ordained through angels by the hand of a mediator. Now a mediator is not a mediator of one; but God is one. Is the law then against the promises of God? God forbid: for if there had been a law given which could make alive, verily righteousness would have been of the law. Howbeit the scripture hath shut up all things under sin, that the promise by faith in Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe.

But before faith came, we were kept in ward under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed. So that the law hath been our tutor to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But now that faith is come, we are no longer under a tutor. For ye are all sons of God, through faith, in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ. There can be neither Jew nor Greek, there can be neither bond nor free, there can be no male and female: for ye all are one man in Christ Jesus. And if ye are Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, heirs according to promise.

But when the fulness of the time came, God sent forth his Son, born of a woman, born under the law, that he might redeem them which were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons. And because ye are sons, God sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father. So that thou art no longer a bondservant, but a son; and if a son, then an heir through God.

Gal. V : 16-18.

For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision; but faith working through love.

But I say, Walk by the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh. For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh; for these are contrary the one to the other; that ye may not do the things that ye would. But if ye are led by the Spirit, ye are not under the law.

Gal. VI : 14-17.

But far be it from me to glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, through which the world hath been crucified unto me, and I unto the world. For neither is circumcision any thing, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature. And as many as shall walk by this rule, peace be upon them, and mercy, and upon the Israel of God.

From henceforth let no man trouble me: for I bear branded on my body the marks of Jesus.

5. *Minor Epistles.*—

Phil. II : 5-11.

Have this mind in you, which was also in Christ Jesus: who, being in the form of God, counted it not a prize to be on an equality with God, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men; and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, becoming obedient even unto death, yea, the death of the cross. Wherefore also God highly exalted him, and gave unto him the name which is above every name; that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven and things on earth and things under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.

Col. II : 6-17.

As therefore ye received Christ Jesus the Lord, so walk in him, rooted and builded up in him, and stablished in your faith, even as ye were taught, abounding in thanksgiving.

Take heed lest there shall be any one that maketh spoil of you through his philosophy and vain deceit after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ: for in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily and in him ye are made full, who is the head of all principality and power: in whom ye

were also circumcised with a circumcision not made with hands, in the putting off of the body of the flesh, in the circumcision of Christ ; having been buried with him in baptism, wherein ye were also raised with him through faith in the working of God, who raised him from the dead. And you being dead through your trespasses and the uncircumcision of your flesh, you, I say, did he quicken together with him, having forgiven us all our trespasses ; having blotted out the bond written in ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us : and he hath taken it out of the way nailing it to the cross ; having put off from himself the principalities and the powers, he made a show of them openly, triumphing over them in it.

Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a feast day or a new moon or a sabbath day ; which are a shadow of the things to come ; but the body is Christ's.

I Thess. IV : 13-17.

But we would not have you ignorant, brethren, concerning them that fall asleep ; that ye sorrow not, even as the rest, which have no hope. For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also that are fallen asleep in Jesus will God bring with him. For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we that are alive, that are left unto the coming of the Lord, shall in no wise precede them that are fallen asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven, with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God : and the dead in Christ shall rise first : then we that are alive, that are left, shall together with them be caught up in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air : and so shall we ever be with the Lord.

I Thess. V : 9,10.

For God appointed us not unto wrath, but unto the obtaining of salvation through our Lord Jesus Christ who died for us, that, whether we wake or sleep, we should live together with him.

II Thess. II : 16.

Now our Lord Jesus Christ himself, and God our Father which loved us and gave us eternal comfort and good hope through grace, comfort your hearts and establish them in every good work and word.

Titus III : 4-8.

But when the kindness of God our Saviour, and his love toward man, appeared, not by works done in righteousness, which we did ourselves, but according to his mercy he saved us, through the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost which he poured out upon us richly, through Jesus Christ our Saviour : that, being justified by his grace we might be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life. Faithful is the saying, and concerning these things I will that thou affirm confidently, to the end that they which have believed God may be careful to maintain good works. These things are good and profitable unto men.

CHAPTER XIX.

THE SOTERIOLOGY OF THE BOOK OF ACTS.

1. *Summary.*—The Soteriology of the book of Acts is in reality as little of an unity, as is the book itself. The writer puts in the mouth of Peter, Philip, James, all the Apostles, and Paul certain speeches, which must be taken to represent the views of the several persons in whose mouths the speeches are put.

It will be expedient, therefore, to present first the views of Peter, then those of Philip, of James, of the Apostolic Council, and finally of Paul.

2. *The Soteriology of Peter.*—

The following are the more important utterances of Peter.

Acts II: 22-40.

Ye men of Israel, hear these words: Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God unto you by mighty works and wonders and signs, which God did by him in the midst of you even as ye yourselves know; him, being delivered up by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye by the hand of lawless men did crucify and slay: whom God raised up, having loosed the pangs of death: because it was not possible that he should be holden of it.

Let all the house of Israel therefore know assuredly, that God hath made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom ye crucified.

Now when they heard this they were pricked in their heart and said unto Peter and the rest of the apostles, Brethren, what shall we do? And Peter said unto them, Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. For to you is the promise, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call unto him. And with many other words he testified, and exhorted them saying, Save yourselves from this crooked generation.

Acts III: 19-26.

Repent ye therefore, and turn again that your sins may be blotted out, that so there may come seasons of refreshing from the presence of the Lord; and that he may send the Christ who hath been appointed for you, even Jesus: whom the heavens must receive until the times of restoration of all things, whereof God spake by the mouth of his holy prophets which have been since the world began. Moses indeed said, A prophet shall the Lord God raise up unto you from among your brethren, like unto me; to him shall ye hearken in all things whatsoever he shall speak unto you. And it shall be, that every soul, which shall not hearken to that prophet, shall be utterly destroyed from among the people. Yea and all the prophets from Samuel and them that followed after, as many as have spoken, they also told of these days. Ye are the sons of the prophets, and of the covenant which God made with your fathers saying unto Abraham, And in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed. Unto you first God, having raised up his Servant, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from your iniquities.

Acts II : 10-12.

Be it known unto you all, and to all the people of Israel, that in the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, whom ye crucified, whom God raised from the dead, even in him doth this man stand here before you whole. He is the stone which was set at nought of you the builders, which was made the head of the corner. And in none other is there salvation, for neither is there any other name under heaven, that is given among men, wherein we must be saved.

Acts V : 29-32.

But Peter and the apostles answered and said, We must obey God rather than men. The God of our fathers raised up Jesus, whom ye slew, hanging him on a tree. Him did God exalt with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel and remission of sins. And we are witnesses of these things ; and so is the Holy Ghost, whom God hath given to them that obey him.

Acts X : 28-43.

And he said unto them, Ye yourselves know how that it is an unlawful thing for a man that is a Jew to join himself or come unto one of another nation ; and yet unto me hath God shewed that I should not call any man common or unclean.

And Peter opened his mouth, and said,

Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons : but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is acceptable to him. The word which he sent unto the children of Israel, preaching good tidings of peace by Jesus Christ (he is Lord of all) —that saying ye yourselves know, which was published throughout all Judea, beginning from Galilee, after the baptism which John preached ; even Jesus of Nazareth, how that God anointed him with the Holy Ghost and with power : who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil ; for God was with him. And we are witnesses of all things which he did both in the country of the Jews, and in Jerusalem whom also they slew, hanging him on a tree. Him God raised up the third day, and gave him to be made manifest, not to all the people, but unto witnesses that were chosen before of God even to us, who did eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead. And he charged us to preach unto the people, and to testify that this is he which is ordained of God to be the Judge of quick and dead. To him bear all the prophets witness, that through his name every one that believeth on him shall receive remission of sins.

Acts XI : 5-17.

I was in the city of Joppa praying : and in a trance I saw a vision, a certain vessel descending, as it were a great sheet let down from heaven by four corners ; and it came even unto me ; upon the which when I had fastened mine eyes, I considered, and saw the fourfooted beasts of the earth and wild beasts and creeping things and fowls of the heaven. And I heard also a voice saying unto me, Rise, Peter ; kill and eat. But I said, Not so, Lord : for nothing common or unclean hath ever entered into my mouth. But a voice answered the second time out of heaven, What God hath cleansed, make not thou common. And this was done thrice : and all were drawn up again into heaven. And behold, forthwith three men stood before the house in which we were, having been sent from Caesarea unto me. And the Spirit bade me go with them, making no distinction. And these six brethren also accompanied me : and we entered into the man's house : and he told us how he had seen the angels standing in his house, and saying, Send to Joppa, and fetch Simon, whose surname is Peter ; who shall speak unto thee words, whereby thou shalt be saved, thou and all thy house. And as I began to speak, the Holy Ghost fell on them, even as on us at the beginning. And I remembered the word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed baptized with water ; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost. If then God gave unto them the like gift as he did also unto us, when we believed on the Lord Jesus Christ, who was I, that I could withstand God ?

Acts XV : 7-11.

And when there had been much questioning, Peter rose up, and said unto them,

Brethren, ye know how that a good while ago God made choice among you, that by my mouth the Gentiles should hear the word of the gospel, and believe. And God, which knoweth the heart, bare them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost, even as he did unto us ; and he made no distinction between us and them, cleansing their hearts by faith. Now therefore why tempt ye God, that ye should put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear? But we believe that we shall be saved through the grace of the Lord Jesus, in like manner as they.

3. *The Soteriology of Philip and James.*—

Next come the testimonies of Philip, James, and the apostolic meeting.

Philip Acts VIII : 37.

And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.

James Acts XV : 13-21.

And after they had held their peace, James answered, saying, Brethren, hearken upon me : Symeon hath rehearsed how first God did visit the Gentiles to take out of them a people for his name. And to this agree the words of the prophets ; as it is written,

After these things I will return,

And I will build again the tabernacle of David, which is fallen ;

And I will build again the ruins thereof,

And I will set it up :

That the residue of men may seek after the Lord,

And all the Gentiles, upon whom my name is called,

Saith the Lord, who maketh these things known from the beginning of the world.

Wherefore my judgement is, that we trouble not them which from among the Gentiles turn to God ; but that we write unto them, that they abstain from the pollutions of idols, and from fornication, and from what is strangled, and from blood. For Moses from generations of old hath in every city them that preach him, being read in the synagogues every sabbath.

Apostles Acts XV : 23-29.

And they wrote thus by them. The apostles and the elder brethren unto the brethren which are of the Gentiles in Antioch and Syria and Cilicia greeting : Forasmuch as we have heard that certain which went out from us have troubled you with words, subverting your souls ; to whom we gave no commandment ; it seemed good unto us, having come to one accord, to choose out men and send them unto you with our beloved Barnabas and Paul, men that have hazarded their lives for the name of our Lord Jesus Christ. We have sent therefore Judas and Silas, who themselves also shall tell you the same things by word of mouth. For it seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things ; that ye abstain from things sacrificed to idols, and from blood and from things strangled and from fornication ; from which if ye keep yourselves, it shall be well with you. Fare ye well.

4. *The Soteriology of Paul.*—

Last comes the voluminous testimony of Saul of Tarsus.

Acts XIII : 38-47.

Be it known unto you therefore, brethren, that through this man is proclaimed unto you remission of sins : and by him every one that

believeth is justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses. Beware therefore, lest that come upon you, which is spoken of in the prophets :

Behold, ye despisers, and wonder, and perish ;
For I work a work in your days,
A work which ye shall in no wise believe, if one declare it unto you.

And Paul and Barnabas spake out boldly, and said, It was necessary that the word of God should first be spoken to you. Seeing ye thrust it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of eternal life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles. For so hath the Lord commanded us, saying,

I have set thee for a light of the Gentiles
That thou shouldst be for salvation unto the uttermost part of the earth.

Acts XIV: 15-17.

And saying, Sirs, why do ye these things? We also are men of like passions with you, and bring you good tidings, that ye should turn from these vain things unto the living God, who made the heaven and the earth and the sea, and all that in them is : who in the generations gone by suffered all the nations to walk in their own ways. And yet he left not himself without witness, in that he did good, and gave you from heaven rains and fruitful seasons, filling your hearts with food and gladness.

Acts XVII: 22-32.

And Paul stood in the midst of the Areopagus, and said, Ye men of Athens, in all things I perceive that ye are somewhat superstitious. For as I passed along, and observed the objects of your worship, I found also an altar with this inscription, TO AN UNKNOWN GOD. What therefore ye worship in ignorance, this set I forth unto you. The God that made the world and all things therein, he being Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands : neither is he served by men's hands, as though he needeth anything, seeing he himself giveth to all life, and breath, and all things ; and he made of one every nation of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, having determined their appointed seasons, and the bounds of their habitation ; that they should seek God, if haply they might feel after him, and find him, though he is not far from each one of us : for in him we live, and move, and have our being ; as certain even of your own poets have said, For we are also his offspring. Being then the offspring of God, we ought not to think that the God-head is like unto gold, or silver, or stone, graven by art and device of man. The times of ignorance therefore God overlooked ; but now he commandeth men that they should all everywhere repent : inasmuch as he hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by the man whom he hath ordained ; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead.

Now when they heard of the resurrection of the dead, some mocked ; but others said, We will hear thee concerning this yet again.

Acts XIX: 1-6.

And it came to pass, that, while Apollos was at Corinth, Paul having passed through the upper country came to Ephesus, and found certain disciples : and he said unto them, Did ye receive the Holy Ghost when ye believed? and they said unto him, Nay, we did not so much as hear whether the Holy Ghost was given. And he said, Into what then were ye baptized? And they said, Into John's baptism. And Paul said, John baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people, that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is, on Jesus. And when they heard this, they were baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus. And when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came on them ; and they spake with tongues, and prophesied.

Acts XX : 28-32.

Take heed unto yourselves and to all the flock in the which the Holy Ghost hath made you bishops, to feed the church of God, which he purchased with his own blood.

And now I commend you to God, and to the word of his grace, which is able to build you up, and to give you the inheritance among all them that are sanctified.

Acts XXII : 16.

And now why tarriest thou? arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins, calling on his name.

Acts XXIV : 14-16.

But this I confess unto thee, that after the Way which they call a sect, so serve I the God of our fathers, believing all things which are according to the law, and which are written in the prophēts : having hope toward God, which these also themselves look for, that there shall be a resurrection both of the just and unjust. Herelin do I also exercise myself to have a conscience void of offence toward God and men always.

Acts XXVI : 19-23.

Wherefore, O king Agrippa, I was not disobedient unto the heavenly vision ; but declared both to them of Damascus first, and at Jerusalem, and throughout all the country of Judaea and also to the Gentiles that they should repent and turn to God, doing works worthy of repentance. For this cause the Jews seized me in the temple, and assayed to kill me. Having therefore obtained the help that is from God, I stand unto this day testifying both to small and great, saying nothing but what the prophets and Moses did say should come : how that the Christ must suffer, and how that he first by the resurrection of the dead should proclaim light both to the people and to the Gentiles.

Acts XXVIII : 31.

Preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching the things concerning the Lord Jesus Christ with all boldness, none forbidding him.

CHAPTER XX.

THE SOTERIOLOGY OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

1. *Summary.*—The student finds that in the Fourth Gospel it is impossible to hold apart Soteriology from Christology. They are inseparably united. To be saved is to believe in Christ, and conversely. They are convertible terms.

The Fourth Gospel omits one of the characteristics of the Synoptics—the parables. The episode of the woman taken in adultery, that reminds so much of the parable of the Prodigal Son in simplicity and freshness (VIII : 1-11) is omitted in the Revised Version. The Master does not so much inculcate ethics, such as the Sermon on the Mount, but teaches belief in himself as necessary for salvation. It is a great difference.

2. *Quotations.*—

John I : 4-13.

In him was life ; and the light of men. And the light shineth in the darkness ; and the darkness apprehended it not. There came a man, sent from God, whose name was John. The same came for witness, that he might bear witness of the light, that all might believe through him. He was not the light, but came that he might bear witness of the light. There was the true light, even the light which lighteth every man, coming into the world. He was in the world, and the world was made by him, and the world knew him not. He came unto his own, and they that were his own received him not. But as many as received him, to them gave he the right to become children of God, even to them that believe on his name : which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.

On the morrow he seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith, Behold, the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world! This is he of whom I said, After me cometh a man which is become before me : for he was before me. And I knew him not ; but that he should be made manifest to Israel for this cause came I baptizing with water. And John bare witness, saying, I have beheld the Spirit descending as a dove out of heaven ; and it abode upon him. And I knew him not : but he that sent me to baptize with water, he said unto me, Upon whomsoever thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and abiding upon him, the same is he that baptizeth with the Holy Spirit. And I have seen, and have borne witness that this is the Son of God.

And he saith unto him, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Ye shall see the heaven opened, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man.

John III : 1-21, 36.

Now there was a man of the Pharisees, named Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews : the same came unto him by night, and said to him, Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God : for no man can do these signs that thou doest, except God be with him. Jesus answered and said unto him, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born anew, he cannot see the kingdom of God. Nicodemus saith unto him, How can a man be born when he is old? can he enter a second time into his mother's womb, and be born? Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. That

which is born of the flesh is flesh ; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit. Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born anew. The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the voice thereof, but knowest not whence it cometh, and whither it goeth : so is every one that is born of the spirit. Nicodemus answered and said unto him, How can these things be ? Jesus answered and said unto him, Art thou the teacher of Israel, and understandest not these things ? Verily, verily, I say unto thee, We speak that we do know, and bear witness of that we have seen ; and ye receive not our witness. If I told you earthly things, and ye believe not, how shall ye believe, if I tell you heavenly things ? And no man hath ascended into heaven, but he that descended out of heaven, even the Son of man, which is in heaven. And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up : that whosoever believeth may in him have eternal life.

For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have eternal life. For God sent not the Son into the world to judge the world ; but that the world should be saved through him. He that believeth on him is not judged : he that believeth not hath been judged already, because he hath not believed on the name of the only begotten Son of God. And this is the judgement, that the light is come into the world, and men loved the darkness rather than the light ; for their works were evil. For every one that doeth ill hateth the light, and cometh not to the light, lest his works should be reproved. But he that doeth the truth cometh to the light, that his works may be made manifest, that they have been wrought in God.

He that believeth on the Son hath eternal life ; but he that obeyeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him.

John IV : 13, 14, 21-26.

Jesus answered and said unto her, Every one that drinketh of this water shall thirst again : but whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst ; but the water that I shall give him shall become in him a well of water springing up unto eternal life.

Jesus saith unto her, Woman, believe me, the hour cometh, when neither in this mountain, nor in Jerusalem, shall ye worship the Father. Ye worship that which ye know not : we worship that which we know for salvation is from the Jews. But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and truth : for such doth the Father seek to be his worshippers. God is a Spirit : and they that worship him must worship in spirit and truth. The woman saith unto him, I know that Messiah cometh (which is called Christ) : when he is come, he will declare unto us all things. Jesus saith unto her, I that speak unto thee am he.

John V : 21-40.

For as the Father raiseth the dead and quickeneth them, even so the Son also quickeneth whom he will. For neither doth the Father judge any man, but he hath given all judgement unto the Son ; that all may honour the Son, even as they honour the Father. He that honoureth not the Son honoureth not the Father which sent him. Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and believeth him that sent me, hath eternal life, and cometh not into judgement, but hath passed out of death into life. Verily, verily, I say unto you, The hour cometh, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God ; and they that hear shall live. For as the Father hath life in himself, even so gave he to the Son also to have life in himself : and he gave him authority to execute judgement, because he is the Son of man.

Ye search the scriptures, because ye think that in them ye have eternal life ; and these are they which bear witness of me ; and ye will not come to me, that ye may have life.

John VI: 26-71.

Jesus answered them and said, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Ye seek me, not because ye saw signs, but because ye ate of the loaves, and were filled. Work not for the meat which perisheth, but for the meat which abideth unto eternal life, which the Son of man shall give unto you: for him the Father, even God, hath sealed. They said therefore unto him, What must we do, that we may work the works of God? Jesus answered and said unto them, This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent. They said therefore unto him, What then doest thou for a sign, that we may see, and believe thee? what workest thou? Our fathers ate the manna in the wilderness; as it is written, He gave them bread out of heaven to eat. Jesus therefore said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, It was not Moses that gave you the bread out of heaven; but my Father giveth you the true bread out of heaven. For the bread of God is that which cometh down out of heaven, and giveth life unto the world. They said therefore unto him, Lord, evermore give us this bread. Jesus said unto them, I am the bread of life: he that cometh to me shall not hunger, and he that believeth on me shall never thirst. But I said unto you, that ye have seen me, and yet believe not. All that which the Father giveth me shall come unto me; and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out. For I am come down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me. And this is the will of him that sent me, that of all that which he hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up at the last day. For this is the will of my Father, that every one that beholdeth the Son, and believeth on him should have eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day.

The Jews therefore murmured concerning him, because he said, I am the bread which came down out of heaven. And they said, Is not this Jesus, the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know? how doth he now say, I am come down out of heaven? Jesus answered and said unto them, Murmur not among yourselves. No man can come to me, except the Father which sent me draw him: and I will raise him up in the last day. It is written in the prophets, And they shall all be taught of God. Every one that hath heard from the Father, and hath learned, cometh unto me. Not that any man hath seen the Father, save he which is from God, he hath seen the Father. Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth hath eternal life, I am the bread of life. Your fathers did eat the manna in the wilderness, and they died. This is the bread which cometh down out of heaven, that a man may eat thereof and not die. I am the living bread which came down out of heaven. If any man eat of this bread he shall live for ever: yea and the bread which I will give is my flesh, for the life of the world.

The Jews therefore strove one with another, saying, How can this man give us his flesh to eat? Jesus therefore said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, ye have not life in yourselves. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood abideth in me, and I in him. As the living Father sent me, and I live because of the Father; so he that eateth me, he also shall live because of me. This is the bread which came down out of heaven: not as the fathers did eat, and died: he that eateth this bread shall live for ever. These things said he in the synagogue, as he taught in Capernaum.

Many therefore of his disciples, when they heard this, said, This is a hard saying; who can hear it? But Jesus knowing in himself that his disciples murmured at this, said unto them, Doth this cause you to stumble? What then if ye should behold the Son of man ascending where he was before? It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I have spoken unto you are spirit, and are life. But there are some of you that believe not. For Jesus knew from the beginning who they were that believed not, and who it was that should betray him. And he said, for this cause have I said unto you, that no man can come unto me, except it be given unto him of the Father.

Upon this many of his disciples went back, and walked no more with him. Jesus said therefore unto the twelve, Would ye also go away? Simon Peter answered him, Lord, to whom shall we go? thou hast the words of eternal life. And we have believed and know that thou art the Holy One of God. Jesus answered them, Did not I choose you the twelve, and one of you is a devil? Now he spake of Judas the son of Simon Iscarlot, for he it was that should betray him, being one of the twelve.

John VIII : 12.

Again therefore Jesus spake unto them, saying, I am the light of the world: he that followeth me shall not walk in the darkness, but shall have the light of life.

John IX : 5, 35-41.

When I am in the world, I am the light of the world.

Jesus heard that they had cast him out; and finding him, he said, Dost thou believe on the Son of God? He answered and said, And who is he, Lord, that I may believe on him? Jesus said unto him, Thou hast both seen him, and he it is that speaketh with thee. And he said, Lord, I believe. And he worshipped him. And Jesus said, For judgement came I into this world, that they which see not may see; and that they which see may become blind. Those of the Pharisees which were with him heard these things and said unto him, Are we also blind? Jesus said unto them, If ye were blind, ye would have no sin: but now ye say, We see: your sin remaineth.

John X : 7-18, 25-30.

Jesus therefore said unto them again, Verily, verily, I say unto you, I am the door of the sheep. All that came before me are thieves and robbers: but the sheep did not hear them. I am the door: by me if any man enter in, he shall be saved, and shall go in and go out, and shall find pasture. The thief cometh not, but that he may steal, and kill, and destroy: I came that they may have life, and may have it abundantly. I am the good shepherd: the good shepherd layeth down his life for the sheep. He that is a hireling, and not a shepherd, whose own the sheep are not, beholdeth the wolf coming, and leaveth the sheep, and fleeth, and the wolf snatcheth them and scattereth them: he fleeth because he is a hireling, and caret not for the sheep. I am the good shepherd; and I know mine own, and mine own know me, even as the Father knoweth me, and I know the Father; and I lay down my life for the sheep. And other sheep I have, which are not of this fold: them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice; and they shall become one flock, one shepherd. Therefore doth the Father love me, because I lay down my life, that I may take it again. No one taketh it away from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment received I from my Father.

Jesus answered them, I told you, and ye believed not: the works that I do in my Father's name, these bear witness of me. But ye believe not, because ye are not of my sheep. My sheep hear my voice, and I know them and they follow me: and I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, and no one shall snatch them out of my hand. My Father, which hath given them unto me, is greater than all; and no one is able to snatch them out of the Father's hand. I and the Father are one.

John XI : 25,26.

Jesus said unto her, I am the resurrection, and the life: he that believeth on me, though he die, yet shall he live: and whosoever liveth and believeth on me shall never die. Believest thou this?

John XII : 23-26, 44-50.

And Jesus answereth them, saying, The hour is come, that the Son of man should be glorified. Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except a grain of wheat fall into the earth and die, it abideth by itself alone ; but if it die, it beareth much fruit. He that loveth his life loseth it ; and he that hateth his life in this world shall keep it unto life eternal. If any man serve me, let him follow me ; and where I am, there shall also my servant be : if any man serve me, him will the Father honour.

And Jesus cried and said, He that believeth on me, believeth not on me, but on him that sent me. And he that beholdeth me beholdeth him that sent me. I am come a light into the world, that whosoever believeth on me may not abide in the darkness. And if any man hear my sayings, and keep them not, I judge him not : for I came not to judge the world, but to save the world. He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my savings, hath one that judgeth him : the word that I speake, the same shall judge him in the last day. For I speake not from myself ; but the Father which sent me, he hath given me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak. And I know that his commandment is life eternal : the things therefore which I speak, even as the Father hath said unto me, so I speak.

John XV : 1-7.

I am the true vine, and my Father is the husbandman. Every branch in me that beareth not fruit, he taketh it away : and every branch that beareth fruit, he cleanseth it, that it may bear more fruit. Already ye are clean because of the word which I have spoken unto you. Abide in me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine ; so neither can ye, except ye abide in me. I am the vine, ye are the branches : He that abideth in me, and I in him, the same beareth much fruit : for apart from me ye can do nothing. If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch, and is withered ; and they gather them, and cast them into the fire, and they are burned. If ye abide in me, and my words abide in you, ask whatsoever ye will, and it shall be done unto you.

John XVI : 7-11, 26,27.

Nevertheless I tell you the truth ; It is expedient for you that I go away : for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you ; but if I go, I will send him unto you. And he, when he is come, will convict the world in respect of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgement : of sin, because they believe not on me ; of righteousness because I go to the Father, and ye behold me no more ; of judgement, because the prince of this world hath been judged.

In that day ye shall ask in my name : and I say not unto you, that I will pray the Father for you ; for the Father himself loveth you, because ye have loved me, and have believed that I came forth from the Father.

John XVII : 1-4, 8-26.

These things spake Jesus ; and lifting up his eyes to heaven, he said, Father, the hour is come ; glorify thy Son, that the Son may glorify thee : even as thou gavest him authority over all flesh, that whatsoever thou hast given him, to them he should give eternal life. And this is life eternal, that they should know thee the only true God and him whom thou didst send, even Jesus Christ. I glorified thee on the earth, having accomplished the work which thou hast given me to do.

For the words which thou gavest me I have given unto them ; and they received them and knew of a truth that I came forth from thee, and they believed that thou didst send me. I pray for them : I pray not for the world, but for those whom thou hast given me ; for they are thine : and all things that are mine are thine, and thine are mine : and I am glorified in them. And I am no more in the world, and these are in the world, and I come to thee. Holy Father, keep them in thy name which thou hast given me, that they may be one,

even as we are. While I was with them, I kept them in thy name which thou hast given me : and I guarded them, and not one of them perished, but the son of perdition ; that the scripture might be fulfilled. But now I come to thee ; and these things I speak in the world, that they may have my joy fulfilled in themselves. I have given them thy word ; and the world hated them because they are not of the world, even as I am not of the world. I pray not that thou shouldest take them from the world but that thou shouldest keep them from the evil one. They are not of the world even as I am not of the world. Sanctify them in the truth : thy word is truth. As thou didst send me into the world even so sent I them into the world. And for their sakes I sanctify myself that they themselves also may be sanctified in truth. Neither for these only do I pray, but for them also that believe on me through their word ; that they may all be one ; even as thou, Father art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be in us : that the world may believe that thou didst send me. And the glory which thou hast given me I have given unto them ; that they may be one, even as we are one ; I in them, and thou in me, that they may be perfected into one ; that the world may know that thou didst send me, and lovedst them, even as thou lovedst me. Father, that which thou hast given me, I will that, where I am, they also may be with me ; that they may behold my glory, which thou hast given me : for thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world. O righteous Father, the world knew thee not, but I knew thee ; and these knew that thou didst send me ; and I made known unto them thy name, and will make it known ; that the love wherewith thou lovedst me may be in them, and I in them.

John XX : 21-23, 31.

Jesus therefore said to them again, Peace be unto you : as the Father hath sent me, even so send I you. And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and said unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost. whose soever sins ye forgive, they are forgiven unto them ; whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained.

But these are written, that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God ; and that believing ye may have life in his name.

John XXI : 15-18.

So when they had broken their fast, Jesus saith to Simon Peter, Simon, son of John, lovest thou me more than these ? He saith unto him, Yea, Lord ; thou knowest that I love thee. He saith unto him, Feed my lambs. He saith to him again a second time, Simon, son of John, lovest thou me ? He saith unto him, Yea, Lord ; thou knowest that I love thee. He saith unto him, Tend my sheep. He saith unto him the third time, Simon, son of John, lovest thou me ? Peter was grieved because he said unto him the third time, Lovest thou me ? And he said unto him, Lord, thou knowest all things ; thou knowest that I love thee. Jesus saith unto him, Feed my sheep. Verily, verily, I say unto thee, When thou wast young, thou girdedst thyself, and walkedest whither thou wouldest : but when thou shalt be old, thou shalt stretch forth thy hands, and another shall gird thee, and carry thee whither thou wouldest not.

CHAPTER XXI.

THE SOTERIOLOGY OF THE THIRD GOSPEL.

1. *The Soteriology.*—The Soteriology of John was simple. He preached the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins. "Bring forth therefore fruits worthy of repentance, and begin not to say within yourselves, we have Abraham to our Father: for I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham." III : 3, 8. What are these "fruits?" To give away one of two coats to the needy, to exact no more than is appointed, to do no violence to any man, and to be content with one's wages.

Jesus preaches to sinners, because he came not to "call the righteous, but the sinners to repentance." V : 32. The Sermon on the Mount appears in the Third Gospel in separate divisions, of which one is in the form of a distinct and complete discourse. The main contentions here seem to be : (1) love your enemies ; (2) judge not and ye shall not be judged ; (3) the tree is known by his fruits. There is a distinct repudiation of mere profession of faith. "Why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?" (4). The end is the parable of the House built on rock, and the House built on the sand. VI : 27-49.

The Third Gospel contains a definition of salvation not found in the Second and the First. The woman who has broken an alabaster box of ointment over his feet is told: "Thy faith has saved thee, go in peace." VII : 50.

When the disciples dispute as to priority in rank, Jesus enunciates the doctrine of humility, that the least should be the greatest, IX : 46-48. XIV : 7-11.

Jesus defines salvation as consisting in the two laws of love to God, and love to the neighbor, explaining in the Parable of the Good Samaritan that the word "neighbor" means any person near in space, without regard to condition or caste, X : 25-37. When he is invited to a dinner by a Pharisee, and is marvelled at for not complying with the usual rules of etiquette, he complains of the hypocrisy of the Pharisees, who insist on details, but neglect the broad principles of morality on which these are founded (XI : 37-54).

It is, to say the least, remarkable, that the Christian world has been divided as to whether the following lines apply to God or the devil. That such a state of things can exist points to some fault somewhere. "Fear him, which after he hath killed hath power to cast into hell ; yea, I say unto you, fear him." XII : 5. The rest of the chapter gives another instalment of the Sermon

on the Mount. Carelessness concerning earthly provisions, watchfulness, attending to the duties of office in the case of the "faithful servant," warning that the truth divides families, and advice to settle differences with a brother "whiles thou art in the way with him," are the main topics mentioned, XII : 37-59.

Repentance is absolutely necessary, and failure to experience it may involve such catastrophes as the falling of the tower in Siloam, and other like eventualities, XIII : 5. Workers of iniquity shall be refused recognition at the last day, even if they have eaten and drunken in the Master's presence, or if he have taught in their streets, XIII : 24-30.

Kind deeds should be done to those who cannot return the benefit, and that the deed should await the doer at the resurrection of the just, XIV : 12-14.

The parable of the Prodigal Son, XV : 11-32, is one of the most important expositions of Soteriology of the Third Gospel. Repentance of itself is sufficient to return to the benefits of the Father, whose love awaits his son afar off, as soon as he returns home. The parables of the Unjust Steward, XVI : 1-12, and of Lazarus and Dives, XVI : 19-31, teach the value of foresight, and action in harmony with it, on the one hand, and the fact that after death it is too late to obey the law and the prophets, for a man may have his good things either on earth, or beyond, but not in both places ; so he must choose whether he will deny himself on earth, or suffer the lack of them beyond.

"And he said unto him," the grateful leper, "arise, go thy way : thy faith hath made thee whole." (XVII : 19). Here is shewn the value of faith, although it does not say whether the other nine lepers were cleansed, with or without faith. The words of Jesus imply however that they were cleansed, even without giving thanks ; so that it is difficult to see the advantage of gratitude, unless it be that the leprosy of those who had no "faith" returned to them. The parables of the Unjust Judge and the Pharisee and Publican, teach the value of prayer, and of deeds without profession. Admittance to the kingdom of heaven is said to be limited strictly to those who are in the condition of little children. The rich young man is told that the 6th, 7th, 8th, 9th, and 5th commandments are sufficient for salvation, perfection demanding sale of goods and distribution to the poor. The rich are said to be in an evil way, in respect to entering the kingdom, and his disciples who have given up everything for him are promised manifold more in this life, and in the life to come eternal existence, XVIII : 1-30. Faith makes the blind man whole, XVIII : 35-43.

Because Zaccheus says that he gives the half of his goods to the poor, and restores four-fold to him who has suffered unjustly at his own, Zaccheus's hands, Jesus says that "this day hath salvation come to this house." "The Son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost," XIX : 3-10.

Summing up, (1) Faith is needed to make sick men whole. (2). Salvation follows obedience of the decalogue, or the two laws of love to God and to man. (3). Perfection demands sale of goods and donation to the poor.

2. *The Christology.*—The prophecies which the writer of the Protevangelium applies to the birth of Jesus are that "He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the highest : and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his Father David : and shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever : and of his kingdom there shall be no end, I : 32-33." As a child Jesus remains in the Temple and asks his astonished parents, "Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?" II : 49. John speaks of Jesus as of one "mightier than I," "the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to unloose : he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire : whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor, and will gather the wheat into his garner : but the chaff he will burn with fire unquenchable, III : 16-17." There is other witness to Jesus, that of devils whom he exorcises, IV : 34-41 ; VIII : 28. They speak of him as of the Son of God, the holy one of God, the Christ.

The Son of man is the Sower, VIII : 1-18. Jesus permits Peter to call him the "Christ of God," and bids them be silent on the subject, IX : 18-22. He declares that he who loseth his life shall find it, and that if a man expects Jesus to confess him before God, he must have confessed Jesus before men, IX : 23-37, XII : 8.

In the midst of a prayer, Jesus says, "All things are delivered to me of my Father : and no man knoweth who the Son is, but the Father ; and who the Father is, but the Son, and he to whom the Son will reveal him." X : 22. He defines the kingdom of God as a state in which, with "the finger of God," devils are "cast out, XI : 20." In the parable of the Unfaithful Husbandmen, the Son of man is the Son of the owner, XX : 9-18. At his trial he says, "Hereafter shall the Son of man sit at the right hand of the power of God." "Then said they all, Art thou then the Son of God? And he said unto them, Ye say that I am." XXII : 69-70.

CHAPTER XXII.

THE SOTERIOLOGY OF THE SECOND GOSPEL.

1. *The Soteriology.*—“John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins.” I : 3. Many of the inhabitants of Judaea and Jerusalem were baptised of him, “confessing their sins.” I : 5. When his time came, Jesus did in Galilee what John had done in Jerusalem, “preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God, and saying, The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand : repent ye, and believe the gospel.” I : 14-15. His mission brought him into contact with all manner of people, and when the Pharisees objected, he said, “They that are whole have no need of the physician, but they that are sick : I came not to call the righteous, but the sinners to repentance.” II : 17. His disciples too “went out, and preached that men should repent.” VI : 12.

The natural question, after all this is, What is sin? “For from within, out of the heart of men, proceed evil thoughts, adulteries, fornications, murders, thefts, covetousness, wickedness, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, blasphemy, pride, foolishness : all these evil things come from within, and defile the man, VII : 14-23.”

Humility is the true guide of life. “If any man desire to be first, the same shall be last of all, and servant of all.” He who gives a cup of cold water in his name, “because ye belong to Christ,” shall not lose his reward. Whoever offends a believing child, is in an evil way ; it is profitable to pluck out even a hand, or foot or an eye if either is the cause of offence. “Have salt within yourselves, and have peace, one with another.” IX : 35. 41-50. X : 43, 44.

“Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not : for of such is the kingdom of God. Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein, X : 14, 15.”

Jesus is asked distinctly what is necessary to enter eternal life. He answers, the commandments, the 6th, the 7th, the 8th, the 9th, and the 5th, besides a new one, “defraud not.” For perfection, however, is needed sale of everything, distribution of goods, and following of Jesus. Doubts as to the salvability of the rich is expressed, and eternal life beyond is promised to the disciples who have forsaken all things for him, X : 17-31.

A man who believes the two laws of love to God and to the neighbor, is “not far from the kingdom of God.” XII : 28-34.

The subject-matter of the two last verses of the First Gospel is much expanded in the Second. “ Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved ; but he that believeth not shall be damned. And these signs shall follow them that believe ; In my name shall they cast out devils ; they shall speak with new tongues ; they shall take up serpents ; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them ; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover.” XVI : 15-18.

No attempt is made to connect logically and philosophically this necessity of baptism for salvation, and the earlier theology given above.

2. *The Christology.*—John preached, saying, “ There cometh one mightier than I after me, the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to stoop down and unloose. I indeed baptize you with water : but he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost I : 7, 8.” Jesus himself says, “ But that ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins—the Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath, II : 10-28.” He is the Physician who comes to call sinners to repentance, II : 17, and the Bridegroom whose disciples will fast when he is gone, II : 19. He is the Sower, IV : 1-20.

The demons seem to labor under the necessity of confessing that he is the Christ, the Holy One of God, or the Son of God. I : 24, III : 11, V : 7, at the moment of being ejected from their temporary tenements by him.

Those who seek their life shall lose it, and those who lose their life for his sake shall find it. Those who confess him before men, them will he confess before God, and the reverse, VIII : 35-38. He repeats the doctrine of humility, X : 43, 44 : adding, “ for even the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many X : 45.” The Son of man is to return, and his servants are not to be sleeping when he does, but must watch, XIII : 36.

Such is the Christology of the Second Gospel.

CHAPTER XXIII.

THE SOTERIOLOGY OF THE FIRST GOSPEL.

1. *The Soteriology.*—In examining the First Gospel's Soteriology, it is necessary to collate the expressions of Jesus on the subject of the content of salvation. This will form, as it were, a body of teaching which may be considered in a particular sense his message to the world. In other words, how does he define the word salvation? Or, what kind of actions are necessary for salvation? Or, are they actions, and not intellectual assents to some doctrine?

John preaches repentance, and considers descent from Abraham immaterial, since God can raise descendants to Abraham from stones, III : 8, 9. Jesus repeats almost the same words, "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand, IV : 17."

The Sermon on the Mount professes to teach men their duties. Here will be found the essentials of Soteriology. "Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven, V : 16." "Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven. For I say unto you, That except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven, V : 19, 20." "Verily I say unto thee, Thou shalt by no means come out thence, till thou hast paid the uttermost farthing, V : 26." This seems to refer to all manner of debts to a brother, debts of unkindness, of contempt, of anger, or of actual debt. Further, V : 39-42, are the commands to turn the cheek to the smiter, to give the cloak after the coat, to go a mile further than necessary, and to lend to the needy. The perfection attainable by man seems to be of the same nature as that of the Father: "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect." But on the part of man this perfection consists in loving the enemy, V : 43-48. Treasures are to be laid up, not on earth; but in heaven, VI : 19-23. This seems to refer to good deeds, to practical morality. The gate which leadeth unto life is strait, and few there be that find it, VII : 13, 14. "Wherfore by their fruits ye shall know them, VII : 20." This then is the standard of perfection, the value of the fruit of the life. Prophesying, casting out devils, and performing miracles in the name of the Lord have no connection with salvation; this is "doing" the will of the Father, VII : 21-23. Such is the Soteriology of the Sermon on the Mount.

The burden of the preaching of his disciples is to be the same thing John and himself had preached, repentance, "the kingdom of heaven is at hand, X : 7."

The subject of Soteriology is only the scientific formulation of the means of salvation. This is expressly defined, XVII : 3, 4. " Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven. Whosoever therefore shall humble himself as this little child, the same is greatest in the kingdom of heaven." Next come distinct definitions from the direct speech of the Master. " If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments, XIX : 17." These are the 6th, 7th, 8th, 9th, and 5th; besides, the command to love one's neighbor as oneself. This then is sufficient Soteriology. For perfection, sale of all goods, and distribution to the poor is demanded, XIX : 21. This is the definition of "treasure in heaven" noticed above. Then follows the direct statement of the difficulty for rich men to enter the kingdom, XIX : 23-26, which is a point of doctrine few believe. For having left all and followed him, the apostles shall have tenfold more in the life to come.

The publicans and harlots enter the kingdom before the Pharisee, because they obey the Father's commands, whether they make profession to do so or not, and this moral is pointed in the parable of the Two Sons, XXI : 28. " But the publicans and harlots believed him : and ye, when ye had seen it, repented not afterward, that ye might believe him, XXI : 32." Evidently, belief means sufficient confidence in the preacher to follow his advice and to repent. This is the very point of the parable.

When the Pharisee asks him what he considers the great commandment, he speaks of love to God and to the neighbor as the summary of all necessary righteousness, and consequently, as the summary of all Soteriology, XXII : 34-40. His denunciation of the Pharisee is on account of hypocrisy, i. e., profession without practice, XXIII : 1-33. The description of the faithful servant is that he gives the household meat in due season, and of the evil, that he smites his fellow-servants, and eats and drinks with the drunken, XXIV : 45-49. This is the positive and the negative aspect of Soteriology, reward and punishment.

There are certain aspects of Soteriology which are pointed out in parables : watchfulness, in that of the wise and foolish Virgins, XXV : 1-13, and use of opportunity by activity in that of the Talents, XXV : 14-30. Of all the parables, none bears more directly on the subject than that of the Sheep and the Goats. Salvation is distinctly declared to be (1) feeding the hungry, (2) giving drink to the thirsty, (3) taking in the stranger, (4) clothing the naked, (5) visiting the sick, (6) visiting the prisoners. Neglect of these duties entails "everlasting punishment," whatever that may be, XXV : 31-46.

So much for the body of the gospel. Many critics have held that the sixteenth chapter was a later addition ; at least the last verses. But we have nothing to do with this question here. The Soteriology of the last two verses comprises two things : (1) Teaching the commandments of practical morality, and (2) baptising.

What this baptising is, what is the penal consequence of its neglect, what is the particular reward for it, what the form of baptism is, by whom it would be administered, at what age, what its effect is—all these are unanswered questions. It need be no more than a recommendation to baptise.

Summing up, the Soteriology of the First Gospel is limited to practical morality. It distinctly repudiates as unnecessary all professions of obedience, of belief, of prophesying, of casting out devils, of working miracles. The six-fold path of morality is to feed the hungry, drench the thirsty, receive the stranger, clothe the naked, visit the sick and the prisoner. That is all. There is a two-fold duty : love to God, and love to the neighbor.

2. *The Christology*.—The Christology of the First Gospel begins with the declaration of John that “he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear : he shall baptise you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire : whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor, and gather his wheat into the garner ; but he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire, III : 11, 12.” Much of the Christology depends on Old Testament quotations and allusions which in the mind of the writer were apposite. “The people which sat in darkness saw a great light ; and to them which sat in the region and shadow of death light is sprung up, IV : 16.” The Sermon on the Mount contents itself with saying, “he who heareth these savings of mine, and doeth them,” VII : 24, and the like.

The Master demanded that his disciples should confess him before men. “Whosoever therefore shall confess me before men, him will I confess before my Father in heaven, X : 32.” “He that findeth his life shall lose it, and he that loseth it for my sake shall find it, X : 39 ; XVI : 24.”

The Master declares that “All things are delivered unto me of my Father : and no man knoweth the Son but the Father ; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him, XI : 27.”

Quotations from the Old Testament declare that, “And in his name shall the Gentiles trust, XII : 21.” He is the Sower, XIII : 1-23, the Sower of the good seed, XIII : 24-30, 36-43, the Rewarder of works, XVI : 24-28, the Seeker of the lost sheep, XVIII : 11, the Lord of the Unjust Steward, XVIII : 23-35, the Hirer of the laborers, XX : 1-16, the Son of the householder, who collects rents for his Father, XXI : 33-46, and the Bridegroom, XXV : 1-13.

After the stilling of the wind on the lake, his disciples say, “Of a truth thou art the Son of God, XIV : 33,” and Simon Peter confesses, “Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God,” and he acknowledges his messiahship by charging them that “they should tell no man that he was Jesus the Christ, XVI : 13-20.”

CHAPTER XXIV.

THE CHRISTIANITY OF JESUS.

1. *Summary.*—The long and tedious investigation which has occupied the foregoing pages has now drawn to its end. The reader has been brought successively face to face with the historical forms of the doctrine of Atonement. He has seen that as he ascended the stream of history it has become ever simpler, until in Ante-Nicene times it was little more than a repetition of scriptural phrases.

The rigorously logical Bernardian and Anselmic forms have been unsparingly criticized from the stand-point of morality in view of the principle that the ultimate truth must be moral theology and theological morality. Consequently no theology which is morally indefensible can be supposed to be final. Thus most of the theories of salvation have been one after another left behind. This is the very fact which must have impressed the reader most, how many the formal theories of the Atonement are, and how inconsistent, and how easily they lead to perverted views of human nature.

If any result has been achieved, it may be said to have been this : that it is hopeless to construct any theories about the fact of the Atonement. The Scriptures themselves give no hint of any. They confine themselves to an austere simple statement of a fact. And the part of wisdom will be to follow in their footsteps, accepting the fact, but refusing, until more light is thrown on the subject, to construct any given theory concerning it.

2. *Theology and Morality.*—Before endeavoring to place before the reader the most important statements of the New Testament concerning the fact of the Atonement, it will be neither uninteresting nor unprofitable to cite an instance in which Jesus distinctly showed how far in his mind theology and morality were inseparable—nay, convertible terms.

One incontestable element of his ministry was his working of miracles. They are too numerous to mention in detail. To repudiate them would only be possible if the written records should be hopelessly mutilated. They must be accepted as historical facts, even if it be impossible to frame any theory which would reduce them to the law of conservation of energy. Here again it is necessary to remember that we are dealing with facts, not theories. The great characteristic of them all was that they were mostly performed for the comfort of the poor and the afflicted, satisfying hunger, and healing disease. They were always inspired by the desire of doing good.

On these miracles Jesus, and the writers of the Gospel relied for proof of his divine authority. When the disciples of John came to him, asking him if he were the Messiah, he answered, "Go, and show John again those things which ye hear and see : the blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, and the poor have the gospel preached to them. (2)" When speaking of the guilt of the inhabitants of the world, he says : "If I had not done among them the works which none other man did, they had not had sin : (3)" Again he says in an uncontrovertible passage : "But I have greater witness than that of John : for the works which the Father hath given me to finish, the same works that I do, bear witness of me, that the Father has sent me (4)." And likewise in many other passages (5).

Besides the power of performing miracles of healing, Jesus had the power of imparting that power to others, who could impart the gift in like manner. Thus the Apostles are said to have performed many marvellous works, and to have imparted that gift to others (6). The textual proof in the matter is so copious that only a few instances need be given.

These miracles or "works" were not mere psychical marvels. To the mind of Jesus they were equivalent to the forgiving of sins. "For whether it is easier to say, 'Thy sins be forgiven thee,' or to say, 'arise and walk' (7)?" Besides, it was usual for him to tell those whom he healed "Go, sin no more, lest a worse thing befall thee (8)." "Her sins which are many are forgiven ; for she loved much (9)." Thus as a part of a miracle, Jesus claimed direct power and authority to forgive sins. The Pharisees said : "Why does this man thus speak blasphemies ? who can forgive sins but God only?" Jesus answered : "But that ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins, (he saith to the sick of the palsy,) I say unto thee, arise, take up thy bed, and go thy way into thine house (10)."

The latter incident seems to have deeply impressed the minds of the Evangelists. Matthew IX : 2 ; Mark II : 5 and Luke V : 20, VII : 47, all repeat it at length. Waiving all theories of miracles, and of forgiving of sins, it becomes merely an extremely suggestive instance of the close correspondence of theology and morality in the mind of Jesus. He merely says : "for which is easier to say." He is the full master of either realm. He can work as easily in the one as in the other. To the Pharisees, they seemed different enough ; to him, they were the same.

3. *Faith*.—Without transgressing the limits we have placed for ourselves, it still appears pertinent to make a few remarks concerning another intimate bond between morality and theology in the mind and work of Jesus. Faith, or belief, seemed to be necessary factors both for the performance of miracles, and for the atoning work of forgiveness of sins, as will be seen later on. "If ye believe not, ye shall die in your sins (11)." "And did not many works there—because of their unbelief (12)." In view of all this would it seem irreverent to find a somewhat unusual interpretation, besides the accepted one, in the words "Be-

hold the lamb of God, that taketh away the sins of the world (13)?”

Faith was also the means by which these miraculous gifts were perpetuated in the Church. “He breathed on them and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost : whose soever sins ye remit they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained (14).” And in remarkable agreement with our exegesis of the passage above are the following words of Jesus : “He that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he also (15).” Besides, we have explicit proof of our point : “Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved ; but he that believeth not shall be damned. And these signs shall follow them that believe ; In my name shall they cast out devils ; they shall speak with new tongues ; they shall take up serpents, and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them ; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover (16).”

How necessary faith is for salvation will appear abundantly from the texts given further on. Hence it appears to be as it were a link between these two great conceptions, lying, at least in a secondary fashion in the different fields of morality and theology.

4. *Facts, not Theories.*—It is now high time to return to the main subject of this chapter. Our task is to endeavor to find the Christianity of Jesus, or, in other words, what Jesus and his immediate followers thought concerning the Atonement. In doing this it is evident that our duty is to seek and state facts. The fact of the Atonement is to be brought forward, if possible, without outlining any further theory than is found in the New Testament. Thus all the inconsistencies and difficulties of the later theories will be avoided, and it will remain possible to point to the bold outlines of what should certainly be regarded as the central doctrine of Christianity. Whether in the future any satisfactory theory is likely to be constructed is after all a matter of little moment. Judging from the past, the outlook is not encouraging. Yet it is quite certain that there is no hope of ever attaining such satisfactory theory until all the facts of the case are brought together dispassionately and completely.

This latter task cannot of course be attempted in so short a treatise as the present. It will be possible only to give what seems to be the most vital hints of what might be, if followed out, the body of the doctrine.

It will appear that these essentials of doctrine are all cast in Scripture language. It may be objected that Scripture is not definite enough, and that it is necessary to explain Scripture, to define it, to limit its meaning to definite formulations. It may be answered that if there is any true Soteriology, it must be the Soteriology of the Scriptures, the Soteriology of Jesus; and how can it be expressed better than in the words which Jesus and which the Scriptures chose to clothe their thoughts in? Besides, only in using their actual words can we be sure of importing into their expressions no foreign meaning. The lesson of all

that has gone before is that when such terrible doctrines have been constructed out of the Scripture words, such a task is dangerous, and it is wiser to limit oneself to just what the Scriptures say, and permit each man to confine his statement of belief to their discussions.

It will appear in the following pages that only some few texts have been set down in endeavoring to set forth this theory or fact of the Atonement. This has been done only for the sake of lack of space. Any and all Scripture expressions on the subject of the Atonement belong here to the subject, and shall be accordingly considered authority on the subject.

5. *Reconciliation.*—The following texts bear simply on the subject of Salvation. “He shall save his people from their sins (17).” “For I came not to judge the world but to save that which was lost (18).” “Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners (19).” “Who hath saved us (20).” “He saved us by the washing of regeneration (21).” “He is able also to save them to the uttermost (22).” “That the world through him might be saved (23).” “These things I say that ye might be saved (24).” “If any man enter in he shall be saved (25).” “None other name whereby we must be saved (26).” “Thou and all thy house shalt be saved (27).” “Believe—and thou shalt be saved and thy house (28).” “We shall be saved from wrath through him (29).” “Being reconciled by his death we shall be saved by his life (30).” “If thou shalt believe—thou shalt be saved (31).” “For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved (32).” “Who will have all men to be saved (33).”

6. *The Means of Reconciliation.*—Besides these texts on the general subject of Salvation, there are others which point out more or less its means. “The lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world (34).” “Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross (35).” “He was manifested to take away our sins (36).” “For I delivered unto you first of all—how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures (37).” “Who gave himself for our sins (38).” “In whom we have the forgiveness of sins (39).” “Who his own self bare our sins (40).” “For Christ also hath once suffered for sinners (41).” “The blood of Jesus cleanseth us from all sin (42).” “He is the propitiation for our sins (43).”

7. *Salvation.*—The purpose of Salvation is the putting away, the forgiveness of sins. “Lest at any time they should be converted, and their sins should be forgiven them (44).” “Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past (45).” “Baptism of repentance for the remission of sins (46).” “And that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name (47).” “Repent and be baptised every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy

Ghost (48)." "Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel (49)."

8. *Salvation, Personal.*—"But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. Much more then, being justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him. For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life. And not only so, but we also joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received the atonement (reconciliation) (30)." The reconciliation was the work of Jesus by his death ; the salvation is the influence of his spirit by grace assisting and enabling us to rise from our sins to-day, "But ye are not in the flesh, but in the spirit, if so be that the spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his (50)." "And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father (51)." "For as many as are led by the spirit of God, they are the sons of God (52)." Here might be added other like texts.

9. *Jesus the Theologian and Moralist.*—In these scriptural words must be cast the ultimate Soteriology. It will look on Jesus as the great Theologian, as well as the great Moralist, the great Teacher, as well as the great Saviour. It will be simple enough to reach the heart of the multitude, and deep enough to be the study of the philosopher. It will comfort the afflicted, gladden the bereaved and quiet the suffering, as well as fire the heart of the missionary, and give courage to the soldier. Women will hear in it their life-long desire, and men will be content with its divine ideal of manliness. The old shall be fond of thinking of it, and children shall dream of it. Girls shall laugh with joy at mention of it, and boys find their eyes glittering with tears. Widely shall the good news of perfect morality, and of chastened theology resound among the tribes of earth, and fit them to be at one some day, when the New Jerusalem shall come down out of heaven.

NOTES

NOTES.

CHAPTER II.

(1) S. Bernard of Clairvaux, Letters V: 11. (2) Ib., V: 14. (3) Ib., IX: 24. (4) Ib., VI: 16. (5) Ib., VII: 18. (6) Ib., IX: 24. (7) Ib., VIII: 19. (8) Ib., VIII: 21. (9) Ib., VIII: 22. (10) Ib., VII: 17. (11) Abail, Lett. 663 Vatican. Cap Haeres. Pet. Abail. 4. (12) Ib., c. 6. (13) Ib., c. 7. (14) Ib., c. 10. (15) Ib., c. 11. (16) Ib., c. 12.

CHAPTER III.

(1) Anselm of Cant. Cur Deus Homo, I: 5, Ans. 1. (2) C. D. H. I: 20, Ans. 7, 8. (3) C. D. H. I: 22, Ans. 2. (4) C. D. H. II: 8, Ans. 1. (5) C. D. H. II: 18, Ans. 2. (6) C. D. H. I: 7, Boso. (7) C. D. H. I: 10, Ans. 5, 6. (8) C. D. H. I: 23, Ans. 5. (9) C. D. H. I: 24, Ans. 5, 6, 9, 10. (10) Ib., Ans. 13. (11) C. D. H. I: 23, Ans. 3. (12) C. D. H. I: 14, Ans. 1. (13) C. D. H. I: 20, Ans. 5, Boso 3. (14) C. D. H. I: 11. Ans. 3, 4, 5. (15) C. D. H. I: 22, Ans. 1. (16) C. D. H. I: 21, Ans. 3-5, Boso 5. (17) C. D. H. I: 20, Ans. 1; I: 21, Ans. 10. (18) C. D. H. I: 11, Ans. 5; I: 21, Ans. 11. (19) C. D. H. II: 20, Ans. 1. (20) C. D. H. I: 21, Ans. 6. (21) C. D. H. I: 12, Ans. 1. (22) C. D. H. I: 12, Ans. 3. (23) C. D. H. I: 12, Ans. 5; I: 19, Ans. 4. (24) C. D. H. I: 12, Ans. 10. (25) C. D. H. I: 12, Ans. 9. (26) C. D. H. I: 13, Ans. 5-7. (27) C. D. H. I: 19, Ans. 9.

CHAPTER IV.

(1) Anselm, Cur Deus Homo, I: 16-18. (2) C. D. H. I: 19, Ans. 1. (3) C. D. H. I: 19, Ans. 4. (4) C. D. H. I: 25, Ans. 4. (5) C. D. H. II: 4, Ans. 3. (6) C. D. H. II: 5, Boso 1. (7) C. D. H. II: 5, Ans. 1. (8) C. D. H. I: 22, Ans. 1. (9) C. D. H. II: 15, Boso 1; II: 16, Ans. 3. (10) C. D. H. II: 17, Boso 3. (11) C. D. H. II: 21, Ans. 1. (12) C. D. H. I: 6. (13) C. D. H. I: 5. (14) C. D. H. I: 9, Ans. 9. (15) C. D. H. II: 10, Ans. 8. (16) C. D. H. I: 10, Ans. 2. (17) C. D. H. I: 25, Ans. 4. (18) C. D. H. I: 8, Ans. 3. (19) C. D. H. I: 8, Ans. 4; I: 9, Ans. 9; II: 18 Pt. 2; Ans. 3; II: 19, Ans. 2, 10. (20) C. D. H. I: 9, Ans. 3, 9; I: 10. (21) C. D. H. I: 9, Ans. 8, 9. (22) C. D. H. II: 16, Ans. 3. (23) C. D. H. II: 21; II: 6, Ans. 1-7. (24) C. D. H. II: 8, Ans. 1. (25) C. D. H. II: 10, Boso 4. (26) C. D. H. II: 10, Ans. 4. (27) C. D. H. II: 10, Ans. 6. (28) C. D. H. II: 10, Boso 6. (29) See (15). (30) C. D. H. II: 17, 18, Pt. 1. (31) C. D. H. II: 16, Ans. 3. (32) C. D. H. II: 15, Ans. 2. (33) C. D. H. II: 14. (34) C. D. H. II: 15. (35) C. D. H. II: 18, Pt. 2, Ans. 5. (36) C. D. H. II: 19, Ans. 4, 6, 7. (37) C. D. H. II: 20.

CHAPTER VI.

(1) Pelagius, Ep. ad Dem. 2. (2) Ib., c. 3, see 13, 14. (3) Ib., c. 19. (4) See Augustine, de Grat. Christi, 4, 18; de Nat. et Grat. 47; de Pecc. Orig. 18; Op. Imp. VI: 9, I: 91, 96; Pel., Ep. ad Dem. 20; de Perf. Just. Hom. 2. (5) Aug. de Nat. et Grat. 7. (6) Pelag. Fp. ad Dem. 27. (7) Ib., c. 31. (8) Aug. Ep. 179: 8; de Gest. Pel. 10; Pel., Ep. ad Dem., 5; Aug., de Nat. et Grat. 36, 38, 42. (9) Aug. de Gest.

Pel. 3. (10) Ep. 29. (11) Aug. c. Jul. Pel. IV: 3, 29; de Grat. Christi, 37, 40; de Gest. Pel. 10. (12) Aug. de Grat. Christi, 4; see 7, 10, 31, 35, 37, 41. (13) Aug. c. duas Epp. Pel. I: 22. (14) p. 179 sqq. (15) de Gest. Pel. 10, 23; de Nat. et Grat. 10, 45, 49, 51, Ep. 175. (16) Aug. de Grat. Christi, 10, 38; Ep. 175; de Spir. et Lit. 2; de Gest. Pel. 1. (17) Aug. de Gest. Pel. 35, 18; de Nat. et Grat. 18, de Grat. et Lib. Arb., 6. (18) Op. Imp. II: 227; III: 106; I: 94, 95: c. duas Epp. Pel. I: 18; II: 8, 17. (19) Aug. de Grat. Christi, I: 3: 3; I: 7, 8; II: 4. (20) Pel. Ep. ad Dem. 31; Aug. de Grat. Christi, 41, 40; Haer. 88. (21) Aug. c. duas Epp. Pel., II: 2: 3; II: 8; de Grat. Christi, 31; Pel. Ep. ad Dem., 29; Synod. Diosp. Charge, 11; c. Jul. Pel. IV: 3; de Gr. et Lib. Arb. 14; Aug. Epp. 1941-98; Op. Imp. I: 141. (22) Aug. c. duas Epp. Pel. II: 5; de Grat. Christi, 7.

CHAPTER VII.

(1) Coel. ap Marc. Merc. 503; Aug. de Pecc. Orig. VI: 21; c. Jul. Pel. III: 8-9; de Haeres. 38; de Pecc. Mer. et Rem. I: 23. (2) Aug. de Pecc. Mer. et Rem. I: 20: 26, I: 18; c. duas Epp. Pel. I: 22; Op. Imp. I: 18, 20. (3) c. 4. (4) Hypomnesticon V: 8; c. duas Epp. Pel. I: 23; Op. II: 108. (5) Aug. c. Jul. Pel. VI: 17, de Pecc. Mer. et Rem. III: 6, 17, 34. (6) Aug. de Grat. Christi, 38, 30. (7) Aug. de Pecc. Mer. et Rem. I: 30; de Pecc. Or. 17-19; c. duas Epp. Pel. I: 23. (8) Aug. Op. Imp. I: 53, 54; c. duas Epp. Pel. II: 6; IV: 2, 7, Ep. 194: 10, 193: 2. (9) Aug. de Civ. Dei V: 19, 20; XIX: 25; Ep. 144; c. Jul. Pel. IV: 3 sqq. (10) de Pecc. Mer. et Rem. I: 21, 30; Op. Imp. VI: 20. (11) Aug. c. Jul. Pel. IV: 8. (12) Wisd. IV: 11. (13) de Gen. ad Lit. X: 16, cf. Ep. 217: 5; de Anima et eius Or. 12: 3: 10; de Pecc. Or. 21. (14) Aug. de Pecc. Or. 6. (15) Pel. in Rom. VII: 8; in de Pecc. Mer. et Rem. III: 3; de Pecc. Or. Pel. in Rom. VII: 8; in de Pecc. Mer. et Rem. III: 3, de Pecc. Or. 13. (16) Aug. c. Jul. Pel. III: 5: 11; de Pecc. Mer. et Rem. III: 3; de Nat. et Grat. 30, 21; Op. Imp. II: 42, 66; VI: 27, 30; de Haer. 88. (17) Aug. de Nat. et Grat. 21, 43; c. Jul. Pel. III: 4; Op. Imp. II: 20; I: 54, 91; Pel. Ep. ad Dem. 2, Op. Imp. I: 91; II: 236; III: 156; VI: 16, 19, 30. (18) Aug. de Pecc. Or. 15. (19) Aug. c. duas Epp. Pel. II: 2: 2. (20) Aug. de Pecc. Mer. et Rem. I: 9: 9. (21) Op. Imp. III: 212; VI: 16. (22) Ib., I: 71. (23) c. Jul. Pel. IV: 2: 7.

CHAPTER VIII.

(1) Aug. Ep. 194: 8. (2) Pel. in Rom., IX: 15, 10, 12; XI: 2, 5; VIII: 29, 30; Aug. de Praed. Sanct. 18, 19. c. duas Epp. Pel. II: 7. (3) Aug. Op. Imp. I: 126. (4) Aug. de Nat. et Grat. 47. (5) Expos. Fidei in Marc. Merc. Patrol. 48: 489. (6) Aug. c. Jul. Pel. VI: 4, 6; Pel. in Rom. V: 5 ap. Hieron. I: 667. (7) Neander, Vol. IV, p. 360.

CHAPTER IX.

(1) Aug. de Spir. et Lit. c. 34. (2) De Lib. Arb. III: 3: 8; I: 12: 26. De Duab. Animab. c. 11. (3) De Lib. Arb. III: 1: 3. (4) De Duab. Animab. XII: 17. Contra Faust. Man. 20, 21. De Lib. Arb. II: 1: 3; III: 1. De Vera Relig. XIV: 27. De Act. cum Felic. Man. II: 8. (5) De Quant. Anim. 36: 80. (6) De Lib. Arb. III: 18. Retract. I: 13, 15, 16. De Nat. et Grat. 67. (7) Ep. 246. (8) De Gen. ad Litt. VII: 26. (9) De Agon. Christ. 10. De Vera Relig. XIV: 27. (10) De Lib. Arb. II: 18: 48. (11) De Civ. Dei, V: 10: 2. (12) De Civ. Dei, V: 10: 2. De Lib. Arb. III: 4: 10. Hagenbach, Hist. of Doct. I: 138. (13) De Doctrin. Christ. I: 3, 4. (14) De Lib. Arb. I: 14. De Morib. Eccles. 1: 3: 4. De Trin. XIII: 20: 25. (15) De Morib. Eccles. I: 3: 4, 5. De Lib. Arb. II: 14. De Trin. XIII: 8. De Civ. Dei, III: 4: 2. (16) Conf. XIII: 8. De Morib. Eccles. I: 3: 5. De Civ. Dei, XIX: 25. (17) De Morib. Eccles. I: 8. (18) Enchir. ad Laurent. 5. De Duab. Animab. 8. De Morib. Eccles. I: 14. (19) De Morib. Eccles. I: 25: 48. (20) De Doct. Christ. I: 22: 21. (21)

De Civ. Dei, X: 19, 6. (22) De Morib. Eccles. I: 26: 48. (23) De Morib. Eccles. I: 26: 49. De Vera Relig. 46: 87, De Doctr. Christ. I: 22: 21. (24) De Doctr. Chist. I: 29. C. Faust. Man. XIX: 24. (25) De Lib. Arb. III: 7: 21. Conf. VII: 12. (26) De Civ. Dei, XI: 22. Contr. Ep. Fund. 31. De Gen. ad Litt. VIII: 14: 31. (27) Enchir. ad Laurent. XIII: 14. De Civ. Dei, XIV: 11: 1. De Nat. Boni, XVII: 17, 20. (28) De Civ. Dei, XIX: 13: 2. Contr. Ep. Fund 33. (29) Contr. Ep. Fund. XXXV: 89, De Nat. Boni, 3, 4. (30) De Civ. Dei, XII: 9: 2; XII: 7; XIV: 11: 1. (31) De Civ. Dei, XIV: 13: 1.

CHAPTER X.

(1) De Perf. Just. Hom. 41. (2) Ep. 217: 5. (3) Op. Imp. VI: 12. (4) Op. Imp. IV: 100, et seqq. (5) De Pecc. Mer. II: 5. Ep. 188: 2. De Nupt. et Conc. 3. De Civ. Dei, XIV: 11. C. duas Epp. Pel. I: 2. Epp. 175, 215, 217: 5, 157: 2. De Spir. et Lit. 30. De Perf. Just. Hom. 10. De Gest. Pel. 3. (6) De Spir. et Lit. 3. De Perf. Just. Hom. 19. De Cor. et Grat. 12. (7) De Cor. et Grat. I: 8. Op. Imp. III: 110. De Grat. et Libert. 15. De Nat. et Grat. 23. C. duas Epp. Pel. II: 5; III: 8; I: 3. Op. Imp. I: 94. C. Jul. II: 8. De Praed. Sanct. 16. De Spir. et Lit. 31. (8) C. duas Epp. Pel. IV: 6. (9) De Praed. Sanct. 8. (10) De Cor. et Grat. 12. (11) Ib., 14. (12) Op. Imp. III: 12. (13) Op. Imp. I: 101. (14) De Gest. Pel. 14. De Gr. Christ. 10. C. duas Epp. Pel. IV: 5. De Grat et Lib. VII: 14. De Praed. Sanct. 2, 9, 11. Ep. 194: 3, 4. (15) De Pec. Mer. I: 9; II: 17, 19. Ep. 188, 214. (16) De Gr. Christ. 26. De Gest. Pel. 14. Ep. 217. C. duas Epp. Pel. II: 9, 5. De Civ. Dei, XIII: 2. De Grat. et Lib. 16. (17) Op. Imp. IV: 126. Sermo 351. (18) Epp. 194: 3, 5; 166: 6; 217: 5. De Pecc. Or. 24. De Gest. Pel. 14. C. duas Epp. Pel. I: 8, 24; IV: 6. Op. Imp. I: 133, 141. De Grat. et Lib. 14. De Dono Pers. 12. De Pecc. Mer. et Rem. II: 5. De Gen. ad Litt. XI: 10. (19) C. 14. (20) Op. Imp. I: 94. C. duas Epp. Pel. I: 2, 8. Ep. 194. (21) C. duas Epp. Pel. II: 6. C. Jul. IV: 8. (22) C. duas Epp. Pel. II: 7. Ep. 217: 5. (23) Ep. 194: 2, 3. Cf. de Cor. et Gr. 10. De Praed. Sanct. 8. (24) Ep. 194: 6. (25) Ep. 194. De Cor. et Grat. (26) Ep. 215. (27) C. Jul. IV: 3.

CHAPTER XI.

(1) C. Duas Epp. Pel. I: 14; III: 3. C. Jul. II: 5; VI: 13, 14, 18. De Pecc. Or. 40. (2) De Nupt. et Conc. I: 26. (3) De Nupt. et Conc. I: 33, 34. (4) De Pecc. Mer. et Rem. I: 26. (5) Ib., III: 12. (6) Ib., II: 27. (7) I: 9, Ep. 187. Cf. de Nupt. et Conc. I: 20; II: 18. De Pecc. Or. 40. Op. Imp. II: 224, III: 42. (8) Op. Imp. V: 64. (9) Ep. XCIII: 2. (10) De Pecc. Mer. et Rem. I: 16. (11) Ib., 1: 21, 27, 28, 55; III: 4. C. Jul. Pel. V: 44 sqq. Ep. 166: 18 sqq. Ep. 186. (12) De Fide ad Petrum, 27. (13) Ib., 3. (14) De Verbis Apostol. Serm. 14. (15) Op. Imp. III: 199. (16) De Grat. et Lib. Arb. (17) C. duas Epp. Pel. II: 5. Cf. de Spir. et Lit. 27, 28, sqq. (18) Rom. XIV: 23. (19) C. Jul. IV: 3. (20) Aug. Civ. Dei, 5. (21) De Nat. et Grat. 44. C. duas Ep. Pel. III: 4. (22) De Anim. et Or. I: 9. (23) Op. Imp. I: 48. (24) De Pecc. Mer. et Rem. I: 21. (25) Ib., I: 9. C. Jul. VI: 7. (26) De Pecc. Mer. et Rem. I: 29; III: 2. De Nupt. et Conc. I: 23, 24. Op. Imp. VI: 22. De Pecc. Or. 38. (27) De Nupt. et Conc. II: 5. (28) Ib., I: 23; II: 5, 33. C. Jul. IV: 4; V: 7; Op. Imp. IV: 27; Ep. 194: 6. De Trin. IV: 13. (29) Op. Imp. I: 47. De Perf. Just. Hom. 4. Op. Imp. V: 59; De Civ. Dei, XIV: 1. (30) De Nat. et Grat. 22. C. Jul. Pel. V: 3. (31) De Civ. Dei, XIV: 12. C. Jul. III: 26; De Pecc. Mer. et Rem. II: 4. (32) De Pecc. Mer. et Rem. I: 15. (33) Ib. I: 2, 4, 7. Op. Imp. VI: 12, 30. De Civ. Dei. XIII: 1. (34) Ib., XIII: 3. De Trin. IV: 13. Cf. De Gen. ad Lit. IX: 10. (35) De Perf. Just. Hom. 6. Op. Imp. IV: 28. C. Jul. Pel. V: 3. De Nupt. et Conc. II: 9; I: 23, 17, 6; II: 35. Op. Imp. II: 15; IV: 41, 68; C. duas Epp. Pel. I: 15. (36) C. Jul. Pel. III: 15, 26; V: 7. Op. Imp. IV: 83; V: 20; I: 72; II: 218; IV: 41. C. Jul.

Pel. VI: 5, 18. De Pecc. Mer. et Rem. II: 4, 33; De Nupt. et Conc. I: 31. C. duas Epp. Pel. I: 18. C. Jul. II: 3. Op. Imp. I: 101. (37) C. Jul. IV: 12. (38) De Gen. ad Lit. XI: 32. (39) Ib., X: 12. C. Jul. Pel. V: 7. (40) De Nupt. et Conc. II: 5, 9, 22. Op. Imp. VI: 25. Cf. De Gen. ad Lit. XI: 32. (41) Op. Imp. VI: 26. (42) C. Jul. Pel. VI: 9, 13, 27, 29. De Pecc. Mer. et Rem. II: 34. Op. Imp. VI: 27. De Gen. ad Lit. III: 18. (43) De Pecc. Mer. et Rem. I: 16. Op. Imp. I: 116; II: 123; III: 93, 104; V: 8; VI: 14. C. Jul. III: 4. Op. Imp. III: 161; IV: 1, 3, 134, 186; V: 11. Ep. 194: 6. C. Jul. V: 8. De Nat. et Grat. 22. Op. Imp. I: 17. C. Jul. VI: 16. Op. Imp. V: 59. De Gen. ad Lit. XI: 37. Op. Imp. III: 198. VI: 17. De Pecc. Mer. I: 37. Op. Imp. II: 87. (44) De Pecc. Or. 31. De Cor. et Grat. 7. (45) De Nupt. et Conc. II: 34; Cf. De Nat. et Grat. 54; V: 12; VI: 6. De Civ. Dei, XIV: 11. (46) De Nat. et Grat. 43. De Pecc. Mer. I: 37. (47) De Gen. ad Litt. III: 20; VI: 27, 28. De Trin. XII: 7. Conff. XIII: 22, 23; Op. Imp. V: 1; VI: 9. (48) C. duas Epp. Pel. I: 2. Op. Imp. II: 7. De Cor. et Grat. 11, 12. Op. Imp. IV: 14; V: 60, 61; VI: 6, 8, 16, 17. De Gen. ad Lit. VIII: 14. De Civ. Dei, XIII: 4; XIV: 27. (49) De Cor. et Grat. 11, 12. De Nat. et Grat. 48. C. Jul. Pel. VI: 22. (50) De Pecc. Mer. et Rem. II: 22. De Cor. et Grat. 11. C. Jul. Rel. III: 7; VI: 9, 14. De Gen. ad Lit. III: 21; IX: 8. De Nupt. et Conc. II: 7, 14, 22. De Civ. Dei, XIV: 28. Op. Imp. I: 17; IV: 9, 45; VI: 8, 14, 16, 22. (51) De Cor. et Grat. 11. De Gen. ad Lit. XI: 7. Op. Imp. VI: 12. (52) De Pecc. Mer. et Rem. I: 2. De Gen. ad Lit. III: 3. Op. Imp. VI: 12, 30, 39. (53) De Pecc. Mer. et Rem. I: 5. C. Jul. Pel. IV: 14. De Pecc. Mer. et Rem. I: 5; II: 21. De Civ. Dei, XIII: 20. Op. Imp. IV: 79; VI: 22, 25. Cf. de Gen. ad Lit. III: 21; XI: 32. Op. Imp. VI: 14, 16, 30. (54) C. Jul. Pel. V: 5, 10. De Nupt. et Conc. II: 14, 15. Op. Imp. I: 71; III: 147; VI: 9, 16, 17, 23.

CHAPTER XII.

(1) De Pecc. Mer. et Rem. III: 3. (2) Ep. 194. De Pecc. Mer. et Rem. II: 27. De Nupt. et Conc. I: 18. (3) De Nupt. et Conc. I: 19; II: 34. Ep. 184: 10. C. Jul. Pel. VI: 7. (4) De Nupt. et Conc. XI: 1; XVII: 22. De Pecc. Or. 33, 34, 37. De Gen. ad Lit. IX: 7. (5) C. Jul. Pel. III: 21. (6) C. Jul. Pel. IV: 13. (7) Ib., III: 9; VI: 9. (8) De Nupt. et Conc. I: 23. C. Jul. Pel. III: 46; VI: 14, 19. C. duas Epp. Pel. I: 18. Ib. (10) C. Jul. Pel. III: 9. (11) Op. Imp. VI: 26. (12) De Nat. et Grat. 7. (18) Ib., 12. Pelagius, Ep. ad Dem. 8, 19. Aug. Op. Imp. I: 88. (14) Op. Imp. VI: 11.

CHAPTER XIII.

(1) Aug. De Cor. et Grat. 10. Cf. Ib., 7. Ep. 190: 3; De Civ. Dei, XIV: 1. (2) De Praed. Sanct. 8. (3) De Civ. Dei, XIV: 26. (4) De Praed. Sanct. 19. De Cor. et Grat. 7. De Dono Pers. 18. De Grat. Christ 26. (5) De Pecc. Mer. et Rem. II: 16. De Cor. et Grat. 7, 9, 13. De Praed. Sanct. 8. (6) De Cor. et Grat. 7, 9, 12, 13. (8) De Praed. Sanct. 8. Op. Imp. I: 127. De Cor. et Gr. 14. C. Jul. Pel. V: 4. Serm. de Verb. Ap. XXVI: 12. Enchir. ad Laur. 29. (9) Ep. 197: 6. (10) De Cor. et Grat. 8. Or. Imp. I: 127. Epp. 190: 3; 217: 5. De Praed. Sanct. 8. (11) Op. Imp. I: 39. (12) Hom. in Joh. Tract. 48. (13) De Pecc. Mer. et Rem. II: 17. Cf. De Anim. et eius Or. IV: 11. (14) De Perf. Just Hom. 18. De Civ. Dei, V: 10. De Pecc. Mer. et Rem. II: 17. (15) Ep. 190: 3. Conff. I: 10. C. Jut. Pel. V: 4. Op. Imp. IV: 181. De Civ. Dei, XIV: 26. (16) De Mort. Ad. 15, 17. Ep. 169: 1. (19) De Trin. IV: 15. (20) Serm. de Temp. 118. (21) De Lib. Arb. III: 10. De Trin. 4. (28) Op. Imp. IV: 87.

CHAPTER XIV.

(1) Pel. Ep. ad Dem. C. 2. (2) Ib., C. 19. (3) Ib., C. 2, 3. (4) See Jerome. (5) Aug. de Haeres. 88. See De Pecc. Orig. 22. Ep. 190: 6. (6) Jerome Ep. 183. (7) Aug. De Pecc. Mer. et Rem. I: 39, in Gratianus, Decr. Pars I; Causa, 33; Quest. 4. (8)

Greg. Nyss. Gt. Cat. C. 7. (9) Ib., 21, 22. (10) Just. Mart. I Ap. 43. (11) Iren. Ref. Haer. IV: 4; 3. (12) Orig. de Princ. II: 1: 2. (13) Tert. C. Marc. II: 6. (14) Cyril Jerus, Catech. Lect. IV: 16, 20, 21. (15) Athanas. Or. C. Gent. III: 4; De Inc. III: 1-4. (16) Greg. Naz. Or. XLV: 11. (17) Greg. Nyss. De Anim. et Res. p. 452. (18) Greg. Nyss. De Hom. Op. 4, 16. Orat. Catech. 5. (19) Gt. Cat. 5. (20) Ib., 30, 31. See Athenagoras, Apol. 24, and Just. Mart. I Ap. 10, p. 48 and 61. Likewise Irenaeus, Gregory Nazianzen, Chrysostom, Origen, Clem. Al., Cyr. Jer. All Latin Fathers agreed that the free will of man was lost after the fall. See Keil, De Doctoribus veteris Ecclesiae Culpa Corruptae per Platonicas Sententias theologiae liberandas. Comm. XIII, a. 1804. (21) Clem. Al. Strom. II: 63; 25? (22) Orig. C. Cels VI: 78. (23) Just. Mart. I Apol. 10, p. 48, 61. (24) Iren. Ref. Haer. IV: 29. (25) Theoph. ad Aut. I: 7, (26) Clem. Al. Strom., II; p. 434, 462. IV; p. 633, 443. V; p. 645, 647. VI; p. 788, 832. VII; p. 860. (27) De Princ. III: 1, 2. Opp. I p. 108 etc. See Cyril. Jerus. Catech. 1: 3; 13: 1-4; 14: 19-2?. Procat. 1. Greg. Naz. Or. 31, p. 504, 505. Greg. Nyss. Or. 1, Opp. I p. 150. (28) Hom. XII in Heb. (29) Hom. II in Ps. L. (30) T. VI: 164. In Genes. Hom. 22, 28. In Ep. Ad Rom. Homil. 16. De Ferendis Reprehens. Homil. 13. Latin Fathers, the same. Iren. Ref. Haeres. II: 37-39. Tert. de Anim. 21. Adv. Marc. II: 5-8. Min. Felix Octav. 36. Arnobius Adv. Gentes. I: 2, p. 88, 89. Lactantius Div. Inst. IV: 16; VI: 24; VII: 5. Hilary of Poict. in Ps. 118 Lit. 5 c. 14. Lit. 6, c. 4. Lit. 17 c. 8. Optat. Milev. de Schism. Donat. 2: 20 Ambrose in Evang. Luc. 2: 14. De Fug. Saec. 1. De Fide ad Grat. V: 2. (31) Dial. III: 10. (?) See Aug. De Grat. Christ. 44. C. Duas Epp. Pel. IV: 11. Ambr. De Fuge Saec. 1. In Luc. I: 3. Aug. De Nat. et Grat. 63. De Dono. Pers. 19. (33) Aug. C. Duas Epp. Pel. IV: 9. Testim. III: 4, 52. De Grat. Dei. p. 3: 4. (34) Origen. de Princ. I: 6: 1, 2. See Ib., III: 1: 13; III: 5: 7; III: 6: 5. Cyril of Jerusalem, Catech. Lect. I: 5. (35) Or. XXXVII: 18. (36) Greg. Nyss. Gt. Catech. 21, 22. (37) Greg. Nyss. De Virg. 18. (38) Methodius, Banq. Virg. XI: 1. (39) Ib., I: 1. (40) Ambros. Enarr. in Ps. XLVIII: 2. (41) Mansi, Conc. Eph. Sess. 5, Sess. 7, Canon 1, 4. (42) Münscher, Handbuch der Christlichen Dogmengeschichte, II: 198, 20; IV: 105. (43) Prot. 10. (44) Orig. De Princ. II: 7: 2. (45) Arnob. Adv. Gent. II: 64. (46) Tert. De Bapt. 18. (47) Orig. in Lev. Hom. VIII; in Luc. XV, Comm. in Ep. ad Rom. Lib. V. Opp. II: 230; IV: 565. (48) Cyprian Ep. 64, ad Fidum, p. 158. (49) Aug. C. Duas Epp. Pel. IV: 8; De Nupt. et Conc. II: 29. De Lib. Arb. III: 23. (50) Greg. Naz. Or. XL, Colon. 1680. 653. (51) Ambros. De Abrahamo II: 11. (52) Aug. C. Jul. Pel. I: 16. See Isidore of Pelusium, Ep. 195. (53) Clem. Al. Strom. III: 16. (54) Greg. Nyss. On Infants' Early Death, and Opp. Tom. II, Ed. Paris, 1615, p. 361. (55) Greg. Nyss. De Bapt. Christ., p. 519. (56) Greg. Naz. Or. XL: 28, 45. (57) Athan. Or. Adv. Gent. II: 4. (58) Clem. Al. Strom. II: 14, 15; IV: 24, 25. (59) Tert. De Test. Anim. 8. Adv. Marc. I: 22. Irenaeus, Ref. Haer. V: 16: 3. Basil. in Aug. C. Jul. Pel. I: 5. Greg. Naz. in Ib., Chrysost. in Ib., I: 3, 6. Op. Imp. II: 36. (60) Cyr. Jer. Or. Catech. XV, in Rom V: 14. (61) Athenagoras, Apol. 25. (62) Clem. Al. Strom. III: p. 46, 468, Ed. Colon. 1688. (63) Ib., Paed. III: 12. (64) Ib., Paed. III: 12. (65) Greg. Nyss. Or. Catech. Magn. 8. (66) Athan. Or. c. Ar. III. T. I. Ed. Colon. 1686, p. 485. (67) Chrysost. Hom. X, in Rom. (68) Orig. C. Cels. III, T. I. p. 491, Comm. in Matt. Opp. T. III, p. 635. Hom. in Luc. XIV, Tom. III, p. 948. (69) Athan., De Salut. Advent. Jes. Chr. Opp. T. I. p. 639. (70) Greg. Naz. Or. XXXI, in Matt. XIX: 12. (71) Greg. Nyss. De Anim. et Res. Opp. Tom. II, p. 670. (72) Athenag. Apol. 27. (73) Irenaeus, Ref. Haer. IV: 37. (74) Ib., Ref. Haer. V: 21. (75) Tert. De Test. Anim. 8, De Anim. 16, 41. De Poen. 2, De Hab. Muliebr. Ambrose in Aug. C. Jul. Pel. II: 3, 5, 6. C. Duas Epp. Pel. IV: 11. Opp. Imp. II: 163. Hilary of Poictiers in Ps. CXVIII: Lit. 15, Sec. 6. Comm. in Matt. X. In Aug. C. Jul. Pel. II: 8. In Ps. LI: 62: 5; CXVIII: 14; LXVIII: 9. (76) Just. Mart. I Apol. 28. (77) Iren. Ref. Haer. IV: 39: 4. (78) Clem.

Al. Strom. VI, p. 652. (79) Chrysost. Hom. LI in Gen. Hom. XVI in Rom. (80) See Vossius, p. 738. (81) Tert. C. Marc. II: 23. (82) Hilary in Ps. LXIV: 5. In Matth. XXII. (83) Ambros. De Fide. V: 2. (84) Ambros. Enarr. in Ps. XLVIII. (85) Iren. Ref. Haer. V: 1, 16, 21. (86) Comm. in Matth. Opp. T. III, p. 726, p. 321, T. IV, p. 495. Hom. VI in Exod. II; c. Cels. I: 31. (87) Aug. De Lib. Arb. III: 10; De Trin. XIII: 10-15. Chrysost. Hom. 66 (T. VIII p. 432, 433) Hom. 24 in I Ep. ad Cor. (T. XI p. 262). Hilary of Poictiers. Tract. in Ps. 68: 8, p. 218. Leo Magn. Serm. 59: 4; 67: 8. Greg. Magn. Morals 17. (88) Irenaeus Ref. Haeres. V: 21: 3. Orig. c. Cels. I: 31. Theodoret, de Provident. Orat 10 (Opp. T. IV p. 660). Hilary of Poictiers Comm. in Matth. III: 1, 5. p. 618, 620. Leo Magn. Orat. 22 Opp. I, p. 72. Gregory Magn. Morals 26: 18. (89) Irenaeus Ref. Haeres. V: 1. Orig. Comm. in Matth. Opp. T. III, p. 726. Basil, Hom. in Ps. 48. Opp. I p. 179, etc. Jerome in Ep. ad Ephes. C. 1. Opp. IX p. 263. Ambrose Epp. 9: 77. Rufinus Expos. Symb. Apost. (Sub. Opp. Cypr. p. 21, 22, Ed. Brein). That the devil was overreached, Cyril. Jer. Catech. 12 p. 170. Greg. Nyss. Or. Catech. 22-26. (90) Greg. Naz. Or. 42 (Opp. T. I p. 691, 692). Dialogue de Recta Fide. c. 1. inter Opp. Origenis T. I, p. 820. (91) De Inc. (Opp. T. I, p. 60-62, or p. 52 etc. Ed. Montf.) Orat. III (II) In Ar. (T. I, p. 439, 449 or 535 Ed. Montf) (92) Cyr. Jer. Or. Catech. XIII: 33. (93) Ib., ib. (94) Greg. Nyss. Or. Catech. 16, 32, 37. Opp. T. I p. 17, 588 T. III p. 72, 73, 92, 102. Hilary of Poictiers de Trin. II: 24, 25 in Ps. 51: 15. (95) Affirmed by Basil, Hom. in Ps. 48 (Opp. I p. 179, 180). Cyril. Al. Dial. de Inc. Unig. (Opp. V: 684). Leo Magn. Serm. L, c. 1, 2.—Denied by Athan. Or. III (II) In Ar. (Opp. I p. 488, 489). Greg. Naz. Or. c. 9, p. 157. Greg. Nyss. Or. Catech. c. 17. Theod. de Graec. Affectt. Curatione, Lib. 6. (Opp. IV: 875, 876.) Cyril. Al. c. Jul. Lib 8 p. 284, p. 285. August. de Agone Christi, c. 11, de Trin. XIII: 10. (96) Comm. in Joh. Opp. IV, p. 41, 42). Origen. c. Cels. II p. 409. Lib. VII p. 706. (97) Or. Catech. 26. (98) Enarratio in I Ep. Petri in Gallandi Biblioth. Patrol, VI: p. 293.—That Christ suffered in our stead, Eusebius, Dem. Ev., Lib. IX, p. 167, and Lib. I p. 38. Greg. Naz. Or. 36: p. 580 and Cyril. Al. de recta Fide ad Reg. Opp. V, p. 131.

CHAPTER XV.

(1) Or. Adv. Gent. XL: 47; de Inc. XLI: 3. (2) De Inc. III: 1-4. (3) Ib., XII: 1-5. (4) Ib., VI: 1-4. (5) Ib., XIV: 7. (6) Ib. VI: 1-4. (7) Ib., VI: 3; VII: 1. (8) Ib. VI: 2. (9) Ib., VI: 5, 8, 9. (10) Ib., VII: 2. (11) Ib., XIII: 7. (12) VIII: 1, 2, 4; XIII: 9. (13) Or. in Ar. I: 67; II: 70. (14) De Inc. VII: 5, 7; XLI: 5, 6, 7. (15) Ib., XIII: 9. (16) Ib., IX: 3-4. (17) Ib., VIII: 4. Apol. ad Const. C.33. Or. in Ar. II: 52, 55, 79. (18) De Inc., IX: 1 Or. in Ar. II: 47; I: 60. (19) De Inc., IX: 2; XX: 5. Or. in Ar. II: 7. (20) De Inc., XXI: 1. Or. in Ar. II: 14. (21) Or. in Ar. II: 81; III: 25. (22) Or. Adv. Gent. III: 2, 4; VII: 4; VIII: 2. (23) Ib., II: 4. (24) Ib., XXX: 1. (25) Ib., XXXIV: 2. (26) Ib., XXXIII: 3; XXXIV: 3; XXXV: 1. (27) Ib., XXXIV: 4. de Inc. XII: 1, 3: XIV: 17. Or. in Ar. I: 12. (28) De Inc. XII: 2, 4. (29) De Inc. XII: 5. (30) Festal Letter V: 4. (31) Adv. Gent. I: 1; XLVII: 4; de Inc. XV: 1; XIX: 1, 23; LIV: 1; L: 3; LI: 1. (32) Adv. Gent. XLVII: 4. (33) De Inc. XVI: 1, 4; XLIX: 1. (34) Statement of Faith, Reg. Fid. Decl. §4. (35) Apol. ad Const. §33. (36) De Inc. IV: 3. (37) Letter 61. (38) Festal Letter III: 2.

CHAPTER XVI.

(1) De Princ. II: 9: 6. (2) De Princ. II: 9: 2. (3) De Princ. III: 4: 3. C. Cels. III: 51; VII: 4, 48. (4) De Princ. II: 11: 7, c. Cels. III: 59. (5) De Princ. II: 10: 4 (p. 33.) (6) De Princ. I: 1: 1: (p. 24); II: 10: 6; II: 6: 3 c. Cels. III: 79. (7) De Princ. I: 8: 3. (8) I: 6: 2; III: 1: 13; III: 5: 7; 3: 6: 5. (9) De Princ. II: 9: 3. (10) De Princ. I: 5: 1. (11) De Princ. II: 10: 7. (12) De Princ. I: 6: 1. (13) De Princ.

I: 7: 4 (27). II: 5: 4. c. Cels. IV: 30. (14) De Princ. II: 1: 2. (15) De Princ. I: 5; 5; I: 6: 2; 1: 8: 4. (16) De Princ. II: 11: 3; III: 4: 3. (17) De Princ. III: 1: 13: c. Cels. III: 30. (18) De Princ. III: 6: 6. (19) De Princ. II: 11: 6. (20) De Princ. II: 3: 1. (21) De Princ. II: 8: 1. (22) De Princ. I: 7: 1, 2, 5; c. Cels. V: 18. (23) De Princ. I: 7: 5; II: 8: 1, 4; 2: 4: 7. (24) De Princ. II: 1: 3. (25) De Princ. I: 6: 3; II: 4: 7; II: 11: 7; III: 6: 6. (26) De Princ. I: 6: 4; II: 2: 2; II: 3: 2, 3. (27) De Princ. II: 9: 7; III: 5: 4. (28) De Princ. II: 1: 2; II: 9: 7. (29) De Princ. III: 6: 1; IV: 1: 29; c. Cels. IV: 5; VI: 78; VII: 34, 44. (30) De Princ. III: 6: 3, 5, 6; III: 5: 7. (31) De Princ. II: 6: 3, 5. (32) De Princ. III: 6: 1; IV: 1: 29; c. Cels. IV: 8. (33) De Princ. II: 6: 4. (34) c. Cels. VII: 48. (35) De Princ. III: 7: 2. (36) Ib., III: 4: 1. (37) De Princ. II: 6: 5. (38) De Princ. II: 6: 3-6; IV: 32. (39) Greg. Nyss. Gt. Catech. C. XXIII. Orig. Comm. in Joh. Tom. 28: 14. Opp. IV p. 392. (40) C. Cels. I: 1; II: 17, 40-42. Hom. in Jerem. X: 2. (41) In Comm. in Joh. 54, Opp. IV p. 153. Exhort. ad Martyr, 50. Opp. I p. 309. See Clem. Al. Strom. IV: 9. (42) Tertullian de Poen. 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, de Pat. 13. De Pred. 9. De cultu fem. I c. Jud. 10. Hermas, Sim. III: 5: 3. Origin Ep. ad Rom. Lib. III. Opp. T. IV, p. 507. (43) Comm. in Joh. I: 40. Opp. IV p. 41: 42. De Princ. IV: 25. Opp. T. I p. 188. Hom. in Lev. I: 3. Opp. II p. 186; Ib., 2: 3 p. 190. Greg. Naz. Or. XLV: 8 etc.

CHAPTER XVII.

(1) Clem. Al. Paed. I: 5: 24. (2) Paed. III: 1: 2; III: 12: 98. Protrept. I: 6; X: 11. (3) Q. D. S. 37, 42. Paed. I: 5: 23. (4) Q. D. S. 40 Strom. II: 14: 58; IV: 24: 153; IV: 25: 154. Paed. I: 3: 7. (5) Strom. III: 9: 65. (6) Ib., VII: 3: 13. (7) Ib., IV: 25: 157. (8) Ib., VI: 9. Eating and drinking is only an accommodation to human nature; Paed. 1: 5. Jesus was deformed, his beauty being that of soul. Paed 3: 1. Tert. de Carne Christi C. 9. (9) Coh. p. 9. Strom. II: 4. (10) Just. Mart. I Apol.: 23; II: 6. Coh. ad Graec. 38. Dial. c. Trypho. 30; 83; 121. Irenaeus for Pattern, 3: 18. (20). 20 (22); II: 22: 4. (11) Just. II Apol.: 13; I: 32; Dial. c. Trypho. 40-43 and 95. See Barnabas C. 5, 7, 11 and 12. Clem. Rom. ad Cor. I: 7; I: 2. Ignatius ad Smyrn. 6. (12) Justin M. Dial. c. Trypho, 141. Hermas Pastor, III: 7. Cyprian, de Op. et elem. p. 167 (237 Bal.); Ep. 31. (13) Origen, Hom. in Lev. II: 4. Opp. T. II, p. 190, 191. (14) "Hiereus," from which come the English words Hieratic, Hierarchy. The only occurrences of this word in the New Testament are I Pet. II: 5-9, Rev. I: 6; V: 10; XX: 6. In these only occurrences the word is never used to refer to the officers of the Church as such, but distinctly applied to all men as human beings. (15) "Presbyteros." Acts XI: 30; XIV: 23; XV: 2, 4, 6, 22, 23; XVI: 4; XX: 17; XXI: 18; I Tim. V: 1, 17, 19; Titus I: 5; James V: 14; I Peter V: 1. In this sense of "elder" or "more advanced in years" the word is applied to officers of the Church. (16) II John 1. III John 1. (17) I Pet. V: 1. (18) Hebr. V: 1.

CHAPTER XXIV.

(1) Matth. XXVI: 71. (2) Ib., XI: 3-6. (3) John XV: 24. (4) Ib., V: 36. (5) Matth. V: 16. John II: 23; IV: 39, 42, 48; III: 12; II: 11, 22; V: 20; VII: 31; IX: 35-38; X: 37, 38, 42; XI: 15; XIV: 11. (6) Acts II: 38; VIII: 20; IX: 31-42; I Cor. XII: 9, 28, 30; Eph. III: 7; James V: 14. (7) Matth. IX: 5; Mark II: 9; Luke V: 23. (8) John V: 14; VIII: 11; Matth. IX: 2; Mark II: 5; Luke V: 20; VII: 48. (9) Luke VII: 47; ib., I: 77; III: 5; Matth. I: 21; XII: 31; John VIII: 21. (10) Mark II: 7-10; Matth. IX: 6; Luke V: 21, 24; VII: 49; XXIV: 47. (11) John VII: 24; XVI: 8, 9. (12) Matth. XIII: 58. See ib., XVII: 20; VIII: 13; IX: 28; XXI: 32; Mark V: 36; VI: 6; IX: 23, 24; XI: 24; XII: 14; Luke I: 20, 45; VIII: 50. (13) John I: 29. See Mark XVI: 16; Luke VIII: 12; John III: 15, 16, 18, 36; V: 24; VI: 35-47;

VIII: 24; XI: 25; XIV: 2; XVI: 8, 9. (14) John XX: 22, 23. (15) John XIV: 12. (16) Mark XVI: 15-18. (17) Matth. I: 21. (18) John XII: 47. (19) I Tim. I: 15. (20) II Tim. I: 9. (21) Titus III: 5. (22) Hebrews VII: 25. (23) John III: 17. (24) Ib., V: 34. (25) Ib. X: 9. (26) Acts II: 12. (27) Ib., XI: 14. (28) Ib., XVI: 31. (29) Rom. V: 9. (30) Ib., V: 10. (31) Ib., X: 9. (32) Ib., X: 13. (33) I Titus II: 4. (34) John I: 29. (35) Col. II: 14. (36) I Jno. III: 5. (37) I Cor. XV: 3. (38) Gal. I: 4. (39) Col. I: 14. (40) I Pet. II: 24. (41) Ib., III: 18. (42) I Jno. I: 7. (43) Ib., II: 2. (44) Mark IV: 12. (45) Rom. III: 24. (46) Mark I: 4; Luke III: 3. (47) Luke XXIV: 47. (48) Acts II: 38. (49) Ib., V: 31. See X: 43; XIII: 38; XXII: 16; XXVI: 18. (50) Rom. VIII: 9. (51) Gal. IV: 6. (52) Rom. VIII: 14.

THE FACTS

CONCERNING

The Doctrine of the Resurrection.

Kenneth Sylvan Guthrie.



CHAPTER I.

THE RESURRECTION IN THE FIRST GOSPEL.

The passages of the First Gospel bearing on the Resurrection are as follows : (A) xvi : 21-23 ; (B) xviii : 3, 4 ; (C) xxii : 23-33 ; (D) xxii : 59-64 ; (E) xxvii : 52, 53 ; (F) xxvii : 62-66 ; xxviii : 11-15 ; (G) xxvii : 1-8, 16-18.

(A) XVI : 21-23. From this it would seem hardly probable that Peter would have been disinclined to the belief of the rising again of Jesus ; hence he must have misunderstood Jesus, or Jesus must have spoken very indefinitely as to the meaning of rising again.

That Jesus looked forward to being killed by the Jews need not imply any but common powers of observation of their temper. Whether being raised the third day referred to a resurrection of the physical body, or only a survival of the soul, is not mentioned.

Again, it may be asked whether the "third" day is meant as a denotation of an exact period of time, or only a proverbial expression for any short period, such as "ten days," or "forty days," among the Jews.

(B) XVII : 3, 4. The Transfiguration seems to imply certain facts.

The suggestion of building tabernacles for the three implies a certain equality in the physical appearance of the three. Moses had certainly died, physically, whether Elias had or not. The interesting question remains, what was the status of Moses ? It is not elsewhere in the New Testament claimed that he was physically resurrected.

The suggestion of building a booth for him implies that he had a physical body, for it would be an absurd thought if he was only a spirit. If he was physically resurrected, then it implies the physical resurrection of an Old Testament character, before the death and resurrection of Jesus ; and consequently, independently of its virtue.

Nevertheless, in verse 9, the whole occurrence is spoken of as a "vision." It remains therefore that the apostles were men liable to see "visions" in which the appearances were identical with those of living men, or at least like enough to suggest the thought of building tabernacles as much for the one as the other.

(C) XXII : 23-33. The conclusions which this passage leads to are as follows :

The Sadducees were opposed to the Pharisees, of whom the former considered Jesus a follower in this respect, at least, on the subject of the resurrection. It seems then that the Pharisees

who formed one of the most religious, popular, and influential political parties of the nation believed openly in a resurrection. So did Josephus, too, among others. The doctrine of the resurrection was then well known, and a familiar religious topic.

The answer of Jesus tells of the resurrected only that they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels in heaven.

Angels of heaven have no physical bodies resurrected for them.

The answer of Jesus seems to infer that Abraham, Jacob, and Isaac, whose bodies nobody claimed to have been resurrected, and had become earth, were already "living" or resurrected long ago. It seems then that resurrection had no connection whatever with the physical body, and that it took place commonly during Old Testament times, without reference to the resurrection of Jesus himself.

(D) XXVI : 59-64. It seems that those who said that Jesus had taught that he would destroy the temple, and rebuild it in three days, were false witnesses.

The utterance of Jesus, beginning with "nevertheless" seems to imply that it was not true.

What, in opposition to this that was not true, he "nevertheless" was willing to assent to, was a Jewish final restoration of all things at the end of the world, at which the "Scribes and Pharisees" could take no umbrage, since they themselves held a like doctrine. The offensive portion seemed to be that Jesus declared that he himself should be the protagonist of this restoration or resurrection.

(E) XXVII : 52, 53. It is extremely strange, if the occurrence narrated in these verses actually took place, that so little attention has ever been devoted to an analysis of it.

It would seem that the saints were vivified immediately at the time of Jesus's giving up of the ghost. They did not go into the city till three days after. It is to be surmised then that being perhaps dazed they preferred to stay near the graves in which they had lain a long while. They must have been almost starved, by this waiting of three days, after a period of death. If people had given them food, the miracle would have become sufficiently well known to preclude their waiting so long before taking a walk. And when they did go to Jerusalem, why did they appear only to a few, and not to all? Either they had to die again, or live eternally. Now they did not live eternally, because they are not to be found at the present day. Consequently, they must have died again. It would seem then that the resurrection of Christians is only a temporary revivification, to die again.

It may be asked again, what kind of saints were they? Not Christians; for no followers of Jesus were martyred till long after his death. They cannot then have had any faith in him, nor can their resurrection be due to any interest in his death. The fact that they were buried near Golgotha suggest that they were criminals, and no saints; for the "place of skulls" was the official place of execution of criminals.

It is to be noticed that their resurrection seems to have been dependent on the death, not the resurrection of Jesus. They celebrated the latter event only by taking exercise and walking over to Jerusalem. The former circumstance brought them back to life. Their own resurrection can then not be dependent on their faith in him, nor on the power of his resurrection. It seems to have been due to his death.

(F) XXVII : 62-66 ; xxviii : 11-15. One thing is made perfectly clear by this event of watching the sepulchre that the two portions of it which are inserted, in several pieces, in a narrative that forms a unity without it. The lesson is that the grave was empty after the resurrection. The resurrection of Jesus was a resurrection of the body. The actual physical skeleton, that was not "broken" like that of the two thieves, was reanimated. The skeleton of the resurrected body was the same as that of the crucified body. It was a physical resurrection in his case.

(G) XVIII : 1-8, 16-18. It appears that the resurrection of Jesus was a resurrection of the same body that hung on the cross : for the grave was empty when the women came. Whether those who came doubted his identity, or if not his identity his death, is not stated.

The results of all these circumstances is :

The resurrection of Jesus was one which left the grave empty, taking the old bones, muscles, nerves and bloodvessels that hung on the cross.

The resurrection of other persons does not seem to depend on knowledge of him, faith in him, or faith in his resurrection. His death alone seems to have been an occasion of resurrection for a few.

There are no promises to his disciples that they shall also be resurrected, or that such resurrection would occur by the power of his.

CHAPTER II.

THE RESURRECTION IN THE SECOND GOSPEL.

The account of the Resurrection as given in the Second Gospel does not add any new points to that of the First Gospel. In viii : 31, ix : 31, x : 34, xiv : 28, are prophecies of the event ; in xii : 18-27 is a repetition of the episode with the Sadducees ; in xiv : 58 a repetition of the "false accusation" that he had said he would destroy the temple in three days ; and in xvi : 1-18, is an account of the event itself.

CHAPTER III.

THE RESURRECTION OF THE THIRD GOSPEL.

The account of the Resurrection as given by the Third Gospel is fuller than that of the First and Second. The passages referring to it are, (A) ix : 22, xviii : 33 ; his own prophecy of his death and "rising again." (B) ix : 7, 8 ; (C) xi : 32 ; (D)

xvi : 30, 31 ; (E) xxiv : 1-47. It appears that a belief in the resurrection of dead persons, recently or long dead, was current among the Jews, and even credible with so skeptical a person as Herod.

(C) XI : 32. Jesus speaks of the resurrection of the whole people or race contemporaneous with Jonas, and of the generation of Jews that lived contemporaneously with him. Knowledge of or faith in him, the effect of his own resurrection seem here to be precluded by priority of time.

(D) XVI : 30, 31. The returning of a man from the dead seems to be spoken of in a most commonplace manner, as if such a thing was at all possible. Abraham's refusal to send some one is not based on the impossibility of such a thing, but upon the fact that even such an event would not command the obedience of his brothers. It would seem, however, that so great a miracle would persuade anybody, unless it were a matter of common and general experience and belief. This is postulated by the matter-of-fact way in which so astounding a thing is spoken of.

(E) XXIV : 1-47. It seems from this account that the resurrection-body is physical. The grave is empty, vv. 3, 12 ; he went with the disciples, v. 15 ; spoke with them so that they did not know that their interlocutor was not an ordinary man, v. 17 ; went in to tarry with them, v. 29 ; took up physical bread, broke it, and handed it about, and thus must have been subject to the law of gravitation and conservation of energy, v. 30 ; declares expressly he is not a spirit, v. 39 ; invites the disciples to handle his hands and feet, v. 40 ; takes and eats fish and honey-comb, and thus must have digestive and assimilative tracts, v. 43 ; spoke to them as a usual man, v. 44. In all this he did nothing impossible to the physical body of any living man, or his own before death. Against this it might be adduced that he "drew near," v. 15 ; "vanished out of their sight," v. 31 ; "stood in the midst of them," v. 36 ; was "parted from them, and carried up into heaven," v. 51. These expressions do not necessitate a spirit-like quality, which would be inconsistent with the above. Sudden appearance among persons who did not look for him, and equally sudden departures, are not proofs of spirit-power. It does not say that his body was taken up into clouds. He was parted from them, and carried up into heaven. This phraseology could be explained on the hypothesis of departure, and ultimate destination. It would seem quite natural to appoint all his disciples to meet him in a mountain at the final leave-taking.

CHAPTER IV.

THE RESURRECTION IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

Whereas in the first three Gospels the subject of the Resurrection is referred to explicitly only in the case of Jesus, beyond a popular belief in the actuality of such occurrences, in the fourth there seem to be three main topics ; first, the case of

Jesus himself ; secondly, the literal resurrection of the faithful, and thirdly, their figurative resurrection during life.

I. *The Resurrection of Jesus.*—The passages referring to the Resurrection of Jesus are the following : (A) II : 18-22. (B) x : 17, 18 ; (C) xx ; (D) xxi : 1-15.

(A) II : 19-22. In the first three Gospels the utterance concerning the destruction of the temple was brought forward by false witnesses. In the Fourth Gospel it is advanced by Jesus himself, as a figurative expression which would have been very hard to understand.

Moreover, like the driving of the money-changers out of the temple, it has been taken from the very end of the career of Jesus to its very beginning. This is a significant and important alteration of order. By this process it becomes a distinct prediction of his resurrection. How far this is then a *prima facie* prophetic evidence remains a matter of discussion.

(B) X : 17, 18. This statement is difficult to reconcile with the numerous passages in which it is distinctly stated that it is the Father who " raised up " Jesus. The latter are however to be found mostly in the Pauline Epistles.

(C) XX. A few facts concerning the body of Jesus may be gathered from the above passage. The grave was empty, v. 8 ; the place where the body itself was laid, was unoccupied, v. 12. Consequently the resurrected body contained all the osseous and muscular skeleton of the dead body. It was so different in appearance that the experienced eyes of Mary did not at first recognize him, v. 14. The sufferings through which the body had been put through would have probably satisfactorily accounted for this change. He asked not to be touched, because he had not yet ascended to the Father, v. 17. The reason given for the request not to touch him is obscure ; the natural inference would be that it would be proper to touch him after he had ascended to the Father ; but this is an impossibility. Jesus goes out of his way to speak of " my Father and your Father, and my God and your God," v. 17. This seems expressive of possessing a nature common to himself and other men. He shewed his hands and his side, v. 20, and encouraged Thomas to handle his hands and his side. The only thing that qualifies these distinctly physical signs is that twice, while the disciples were assembled, and the doors being shut, he stood in their midst, vv. 19, 26. But in no other document would that appear strange, or mean any more than that he entered unnoticed, or entered before the doors were shut, and when they were closed, stood in their midst.

(D) XXI : 1-15. In this passage it is related that Jesus prepared a fire, and fish and bread, and gave to them to eat. This could not have occurred unless his body had been physical and able to hold in his physical hand physical bread and physical fishes.

II. *The Resurrection of the Dead.*—Besides referring to the resurrection of Jesus himself, it refers to the resurrection of other dead persons, as is recorded also in the Third Gospel, in

the case of the son of the widow of Nain. The passages which relate to this topic are (A) v : 25-30 ; (B) xi : 21-27, 40-46.

(A) V : 25-30. If there be any real distinction between verses 25, and 28, it would seem that when the above was written was the time when the dead should hear the voice of the Son of God, with a choice of "hearing" and "not hearing." Then, when "the hour" should come, those who had decided to "hear" should enter the resurrection of life, and the others, the resurrection under the name of "damnation." It is evident that a person must be as alive to go into the resurrection of damnation, as into the resurrection of life. The latter word is then a figurative expression, that does not mean life as distinguished from death, but which seems to denote a pleasant state of life. This will henceforth be referred to as "life (II)."

It is evident from the above that conscious existence after death, that is, life (I), of the same kind of life as is enjoyed before death here on earth, is the lot both of good and bad, either in damnation or life (II). Actual existence after death is then the lot of all men, before the advent of Jesus, as well as after. This life (I) after death is moreover a state in which a man may choose whether he will or will not "hear" the Son of God. This state is not dependent on Jesus in any way, and would have existed even if the latter had never been born on earth. The resurrection spoken of, besides, is not said to have any relation to the resurrection of Jesus. That there will be a resurrection for all men, naturally, is plainly stated. Of course, the resurrected state may be one of pain or pleasure, but still it is a state of life (I), or conscious existence ; for it is absurd to speak of the damnation of a person who does not exist.

The only influence which the "Son of God" seems to have is to preach to the dead, and, inferentially only, to preach judgment to the dead ; to decide whether they shall be in pain or pleasure.

(B) XI : 21-27 ; 40-46. It may be convenient to consider the case of the son of the widow of Nain together with the case of Lazarus.

It seems that this "resurrection," of which Jesus says, v. 26, that those who believe in him shall "never die," and is therefore of the same category as the other cases of promised resurrection, reanimated the same body that had "died." The same osseous muscular, nervous, and blood-vessel skeleton that was laid in the grave was revived to former life. Lazarus and the young man of Nain must have died again later on, or they would be living to-day. A resurrection meant nothing more, then, than a temporary prolongation of life, in cases where the body was still intact in its main outline and parts.

The strange part of this is that Lazarus, who must have believed, during his life-time, on Jesus as much as his sisters, did die. And when he was dead, his resurrection did not take place because, like other normal dead, he "heard" the voice of the Son of God, but only because his sister believed, v. 40. It is not then those who believe who shall be resurrected, and shall never

die, but those "for whom" other people believe. They themselves, apparently, have nothing to do with the matter, and might be as unbelieving, or as evil-mannered as any of those who are not as fortunate in having other people believe for them.

If however it be contended that Lazarus rose, not because his sister who, according to strict justice should have been the one to "never die," but believed for him—but because he heard the "voice of the Son of God," then it remains that the dead who who decided to "hear" the voice of the Son of God should have been resurrected during the lifetime of Jesus; and as very few were then resurrected, it would then appear that no other resurrections should ever take place.

It is to be noticed that Martha believed as a common-place matter in a resurrection "at the last day." Such a resurrection "at the last day" had then no connection with Jesus, his life, death or resurrection. The point made in the passage above quoted is that the resurrection shall not only take place at the last day, as all the Pharisees believed, but immediately, and in connection with this immediate resurrection Jesus uses the full language that is anywhere applied to any normal, and not only extraordinary, resurrection. It would seem then that Lazarus, the young man of Nain, and the "saints" of Golgotha, were persons in whose case the real resurrection occurred; but this would leave the rest of the world without hope. If, again, it be held that the resurrection preached by Jesus was the resurrection "at the last day," it is evident that this was nothing new to the main body of Jewish people, as Paul proved when he freed himself by appealing to the belief of the Pharisees on the subject, as against the Sadducees.

III. *The Resurrection of the Living*.—Besides a resurrection promised to the dead, a Resurrection was generally promised to the living while alive. This is referred to in (A) IV : 10-14, 36; (B) v : 24, 39, 40; (C) vi : 27-38, 47-53, 56-58; (D) vii : 38; (E) viii : 12, 24; (F) xii : 24, 25, 50; (G) xvii : 2, 3.

In all these passages it is asserted that immediately on knowledge of God or faith in Jesus Christ the person is passed from death unto life eternal. It is plain that this word "life" is not life (I), the natural, physical life of mind soul and body. It may mean life (II), an undefined addition of some sort which is called "life eternal," but which does not hinder the person from dying, in the primary and usual sense. This is a resurrection from the dead (not dead) (I), but dead (II), meaning something as far from death (I), as life (II) is from life (I), but which does not hinder full health of life (I), the only actual life known or spoken of usually. This is the resurrection of the living, resurrection (II), a theoretic state whose use and purport and nature is apparently still unknown. For if it were of any use, if it were an actuality, if it is an immediate change into eternal life, it should at least prolong life on earth, or in some way effectuate an actuality which could be in some manner seen, felt, observed, or understood.

IV. Special Resurrection of the Dead.—When it is asked what use this theoretic resurrection (II) is, it is pointed out that it actually constitutes being raised at the last day.

Such passages are, vi : 39, 40, 54.

But it may be asked, what is the use of this "resurrection at the last day"? It has been already seen that a resurrection will take place in any case, for good and bad.

Again, the former passages represent the believer as immediately receiving eternal life, and therefore, it would seem, in no need of being raised once more at the last day.

As it has been seen, the dead possess the power of "hearing" or "not hearing" at will. If then the resurrection unto "life (II)" can take place, what is the use of additional faith in this life?

For the sake of greater clearness, it will be well to distinguish two senses of life (II). It is used to denote the theoretic "life" added to the natural "life" immediately on having faith in the Son of God, here on earth. Above it was used to denote the opposite of damnation, or an added somewhat to the life (I) of the soul after death in the resurrection of just and unjust. Perhaps it may be wise to denote the former by "life (III)," and the latter by "life (IV)." The senses of "death" will be analogous to these distinctions.

CHAPTER V.

THE RESURRECTION IN THE BOOK OF ACTS.

The utterances of the Book of Acts on the subject of the Resurrection fall naturally into four main topics: first, that the Pharisees held the doctrine; secondly, that the apostles considered themselves witnesses of the event, God being the power that raised Jesus. Thirdly, explanations of the fact are attempted; and lastly, the accounts of the occasions on which Paul stood face to face with Jesus.

I. The Resurrection Taught by Pharisees.—The passages of the Book of Acts which bear on the belief of the Jews on the subject of the Resurrection are (A) iv : 12; (B) xxiii : 6-9; xxiv : 15, 20, 21.

(A) IV : 13. In this passage the gist of the opposition of the Pharisees to the Christians is set forth. They did not find fault with the latter for preaching the resurrection of the dead, as will appear in the following passages, in which, on this subject, the Pharisees undertook to support Paul against the Sadducees. The trouble was that the Christians restricted this universal resurrection to believers in Jesus, and "through" him preached the doctrines of a judgment to come, in which he was to play the most prominent part. It is evident, therefore, how far the Christians were from being the discoverers of the doctrine of the Resurrection. They were accused by the Pharisees of perverting it by limiting it to the followers of Jesus. In modern times the impression prevails that it was the Resurrection of Jesus

which originated and substantiated the idea of a Resurrection. This opinion could hardly be more erroneous, especially as Jesus preached, as recorded in the Fourth Gospel, a resurrection of the just and unjust, the distinctive tenet of the Pharisees.

(B) XXXIII : 6-9 ; xxiv : 15, 20, 21. It is plain from these lines, which show that the Pharisees were more opposed to the Sadducees than to Paul, that they believed in a resurrection. In xxiv : 15 Paul distinctly acknowledges this ; and later brings to bear the fact that by that appeal to prejudice of party he saved himself. His conscience did not seem to be quite at ease about his appeal to the prejudices of his accusers. This very fact shows how thoroughly he realized the deep-rooted faith of the Pharisees on the subject.

II. *Witness of the Resurrection of Jesus.*—The passages that affirm the resurrection of Jesus, and assert that God raised him, are very numerous, and mostly alike. They may follow here.

(A) I : 21, 22 ; (B) ii : 32, 33 ; iv : 10, 33 ; v : 29-32 ; (C) x : 40-42 ; xiii : 30, 31.

The texts adduced need no comment. In x : 41 it is expressly stated that the apostles eat and drank with Jesus after his Resurrection. This of course implies a physical digestive tract, and complementary organs of assimilation and rejection of elements containing no nourishment.

III. *Explanations of the Resurrection.*—The only attempted explanation of the Resurrection are quotations from the Psalms, and two further statements. (A) II : 31 ; xiii : 32-37 ; (B) ii : 24 ; (C) xvii : 31, 32.

It is hard to make the portions of this text illustrate each other. Either God, who is stronger than death, raised up Jesus, or Jesus resurrected himself ; in which case alone the statement that "it was not possible that he should be holden of it," would have any significance. For if it was God that raised him, it is quite comprehensible that death could have held him ; at least, this is the logical inference, whether the writer of these words was aware of it, or not.

The objections of the Athenians seem to have been directed against the Pharisaic doctrine of the Resurrection. The words of Paul are directed at another subject, that of the Judgeship of Jesus at the Last Day. The raising from the dead of Jesus seems to have been considered by Paul an assurance that he would return at the latter day as Judge of all. There does not seem to exist between the two ideas, however, any necessary philosophical connection. The one event could exist perfectly without the other, and conversely.

IV. *Paul's Personal Experience.*—Although Paul was as "one born out of due time," yet he considered himself not one whit behind the chiefest of the Apostles. His call had not been from man but from Jesus himself. This personal experience of Paul's is the basis of his "gospel." References are : (A) XXV : 19 ; (B) xxii : 17-21 ; (C) ix : 3-9 ; xxii : 6-11 ; xxvi : 12-18 ; (D) xxvi : 19.

(A) XXV : 19. What this "alive" means when Paul affirmed

Jesus to be such, is not clear. It might signify the opposite of "dead," and thus apply to a physical resurrection. Yet, the word "alive" might merely apply to spiritual existence outside of the body.

(B) XXII : 17-21. This conversation with the Lord in the temple evidently took place "in a trance." There was no need of a resurrection of the physical body for such a spiritual appearance in a trance.

(C) IX : 3-9 ; xxii : 6-11 ; xxvi : 12-16. Paul's conversion seems to have formed the turning-point of his career. If ever he saw the Lord Jesus it was now. And yet, serious inconsistencies arise in his repetition of the story. In the first version, his companions hear a voice, but see no light ; in the second, they hear no voice, but see a light. In the third, the glory covers them too and throws them to the ground. These inconsistencies cause opportunities for grave reflection as to the objectivity of the vision. Certainly, at any rate, Jesus did not have a physical body that could be handled, and seen, and which could eat. If this was Jesus himself, it remains to be asked, why was his body here of different consistency than it was when Thomas, and the other Apostles saw it ?

(D) XXVI : 19. The objectivity of the above visions, or rather the actual presence of the physical body of the resurrected Jesus is set at rest by the following lines, which impress on the reader clearly the fact that it was a vision, and not the appearance of the resurrected Jesus in his resurrected physical body : "I was not disobedient unto the heavenly vision." It would seem then that Paul himself saw Jesus, but only in trances and visions. He never saw the resurrected Jesus himself in his physical resurrection-body. Whether therefore he saw a different Jesus or whether he and the other Apostles differed as to his nature and body, is not clear. It should be remembered that under ordinary circumstances an event of so marvelous a nature, and so great a significance would have been unlikely to remain so much in doubt through so serious inconsistencies in the stories of those who were witnesses of the events.

CHAPTER VI.

THE RESURRECTION IN THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.

As is to be expected from the nature of an Epistle, that to the Romans contains few assertions of the fact of the Resurrection, or explanations of it. On the contrary, it sets forth at length the practical application of the resurrection of Jesus.

I. *Assertions of the Resurrection of Jesus.*—There are two verses, i : 4, and x : 9, which set forth the actuality of the Resurrection of Jesus.

II. *Explanations of the Resurrection.*—There are two short passages which may explain in which manner immortality can be attained, (A) II : 7, and iv : 22-25. "To them who by patient

continuance in well doing seek for glory and honour and immortality, eternal life." This has reference evidently to life (III), or that immortality which can be attained during the present life, or life (I). The means is said to be, well-doing. This is righteousness, and may be distinguished by the sign righteousness (I).

The writer of the Epistle to the Romans knows of a different kind of righteousness, which is theoretical, being imputed to those who by faith believe in Jesus.

This is set forth in the following lines. It may be incidentally remarked that by this means, of the similarity of sound between righteousness (I) and righteousness (II) the whole difficulty of reconciling justification by faith and personal morality is apparently solved, verses 22-25.

This seems to be a step in advance of the Fourth Gospel in which eternal life by faith in Jesus is the only thing promised. The writer of it does not define eternal life, nor its use. The writer of the Epistle to the Romans connects that theory with the practical life, and likens the death of Jesus to the atonement or reconciliation, and his resurrection to every man's personal sanctification, or righteousness (II) by the assistance of the Spirit of the Resurrected Jesus. Voluminous reassessments of this stand-point are given below.

(B) XI : 15. Such a life from the dead, depending on the Jews being received back to glory, or, in other words, by their conversion to Christianity, is not here applied to any particular being ; and as immortality is inseparable from a person who shall be immortal, it is only a figure of speech.

III. *Practical Aspect of the Resurrection.*—The stand-point of the writer of the Epistle to the Romans seems to be contained mainly in v : 6-21 ; vi : 4-II, 22, 23 ; viii : 11-13. The theory seems to be as follows :

By his death on Golgotha, Jesus effected the atonement, or reconciliation, good for all men at all times. By his resurrection into a spiritual state, he has become able to assist each person in gaining their salvation, or sanctification. This is called resurrection (II), or eternal life (III). This "eternal life" is given to men's "mortal bodies" while still in the flesh. The promise of life does not touch life (I), but probably refers to some post-mortem state.

CHAPTER VII.

THE RESURRECTION OF THE EPISTLES TO THE CORINTHIANS.

The First Epistle to the Corinthians contains special treatment of the topic under discussion. It contains more variety of argument and illustration than other writings of the New Testament. It treats not only of the fact of the Resurrection of Jesus, but also of the necessity of the connection between the Resurrection of Jesus and the resurrection of all other people.

It asserts that a resurrection in life, would not be worth while without the one after death, discusses the circumstances and facts of the post-mortem resurrection, the kind of change that will take place at death, and during life.

Before beginning these involved considerations it may be helpful to define the terms to be used.

(1) Life (I) is the natural physiological and historical human life, death (I) being its ending.

(2) Life (V) is the natural continuation of this beyond the grave, both for just and unjust. There is no kind of death to correspond to this.

(3) Life (II) refers to figurative life, or theoretical life, its opposite being death (II). It refers collectively to the two following kinds of life and death.

(4) Life (III) and death (III) refer to a theoretical state of life (I) and death (I). It arises from faith in Jesus, or denotes its opposite. This life in no wise interferes with the normal historical and physiological life (I) and death (I). It is called immortality, but does not seem to affect death (I) in the least degree. There is no experimental sign by which its presence can be ascertained.

(5) Life (IV) is not opposed often to death (IV), or "second death"; more often to "damnation." It is a state of life (V), a superadded somewhat, possibly being pleasurableness of life (V). Death (IV) is likewise only the painfulness of life (V).

(6) Resurrection (I) refers to the change between death (I) and life (V). This occurs naturally for all men, just as well as unjust.

(7) Resurrection (II) refers to the addition of life (III) to life (I), the inference being that all men while in life (I) are naturally in death (III).

(8) Resurrection (III) may refer to the change from or rather addition to life (V) of the theoretical conditions referred to as life (IV) and death (IV). This is presumably to occur at "the last day."

(9) Resurrection (IV) may be the label of the temporary re-animation (a short while after death) (I) which occurred in the cases of Jesus, the young man of Nain, and Lazarus. The same physical body constitutes the resurrection-body; so that the grave or bier are empty. This may be called resurrection-body (I).

(10) Resurrection-body (II) may denote the "spiritual body" of i : Cor. xv, which is different from the "natural body," or resurrection-body (I), and which arises from the total disintegration of the "natural body," or potential resurrection-body (I), as a seed. It is "changed" from body (I), and differing from it in the matter of corruption, dishonour, weakness.

I. *Facts of the Resurrection of Jesus.*—The writer of the Epistles under consideration claims to have seen the resurrected Jesus, xv : 4-8, and vi : 14.

It is however to be noticed, that although the writer claims to have seen Jesus in the same way and with the same veridicity as

the other Apostles, the accounts of these appearances differ. When Jesus came to the Apostles he had a physical resurrection-body (I), which could eat and drink, be handled, and walk around to Emmaus, in full sight of all men. When the writer saw Jesus it was only in a "heavenly vision," by-standers not seeing the form, and, according to conflicting accounts, either hearing the voice, or seeing a light. This seems to be closer to resurrection-body (II). It may be questioned, therefore, whether the writer was under the impression that the resurrection of Jesus did not imply a resurrection-body (I) such as the other writers describe. There seems to be here a hopeless difference of opinion.

The greatest significance of this conflict of opinions is that it should occur in a matter of so vital an importance ; for the sake of witness to which, in fact, the Apostles considered themselves bound to perpetuate their body from among men who had been witnesses along with them. But it seems clear that if the early witnesses disagreed, it is hopeless to attain any certainty on the subject at this late date.

Besides, it is the investigator's duty to ask himself what the actual circumstances could have been which by any means could have led to so serious a divergence of opinions. That the witnesses did their work independently is the best proof of the difference of their teachings. The whole matter, however, can never lead to any conclusions more certain than conjectures, without power to enforce the assent of any other man.

II. Necessity of Connection.

In the opinion of the writer, the connection between any resurrection of other persons depended directly upon the validity or power of the resurrection of Jesus himself, xv : 12-15.

If the dead rise not, then Christ is not raised ; and if Christ is not raised, the dead rise not.

This position is hardly scientific. The fact of the resurrection of Jesus, and the fact of the resurrection of other people, should be historically verifiable on their own merits ; and should not depend for veridicity on the supposed consequences of such a fact. If it is a historical fact that Jesus rose, it matters not whether others rise or do not rise, as far as its veridicity goes, it matters not what happened to Jesus. Such verification is only of use if the facts are not historically verified.

It is capable of proof, however, that many resurrections (II) took place which did not depend on the resurrection of Jesus. So with the young man of Nain, Lazarus, and the "saints" of Golgotha.

Moreover, if it be true that there be a resurrection of the just and of the unjust, as Paul in the Book of Acts teaches, then this resurrection (I) has no connection whatsoever with the resurrection of Jesus.

This is not all. Even if it be true that all resurrections depend on that of Jesus, how does the connection take place ? What is the agency by which the influence of the one event affects the other ? If appeal is taken to the infinite and inscrut-

able wisdom and power of God, the question may be asked, if everything is explained by omnipotence, then what was the need of the resurrection of Jesus himself? Omnipotency could as well resurrect persons because it desired to do so, as resurrect them by the resurrection of some other person.

III. *Deadness in Sins*.—Abandonment of sins depends on the resurrection of Jesus, xv : 16, 17, 31.

It is evident that if the question of being in sin or not, even for the past, is dependent on the question whether, at some particular time in the past a faith in the resurrection of Jesus was entertained or not, the state of being in sin or out of it is purely an intellectual abstraction. For if it be more than an intellectual abstraction, if it have ever so little an actuality corresponding to it, this is a fact of experience, which no kind of intellectual belief or assent would alter, especially in a retroactive sense. The mere possibility of a retroactive application of the dependence of sin or freedom of sin on faith in the resurrection of Jesus Christ shows that that actual sins and the sins Paul speaks about are distinctly different things ; the first, facts of experience, the second, theoretic abstractions. It becomes clear that in reality Paul considered that as soon as a man believed in Jesus's resurrection, he was saved by that opinion, wholly irrespective of the sins he had or still should commit in the future.

To die daily infers that organic life (I) persists continually ; life (III), the theoretical abstraction, and death (III), having not the slightest influence on it.

It is plain that Augustin and Calvin were only logical in concluding from such premisses that all who did not believe in the resurrection, and sealed that by baptism, were eternally damned; for then all men, bad or good, were in sin, irrespective of the actual sins. So then a person who theoretically was out of sin could be saved even if he were worse than the heathen who was damned. But this separates religion wholly from morality ; makes it immoral ; in other words, relegates it to the limbo of theoretical abstractions.

IV. *Belief and Destruction*.—If Jesus is not risen, then are the dead perished. XV : 18. Besides, even if life (III) was possessed, it was useless if it did not lead to life beyond the grave, xv : 19, 29, 30, 32.

Evidently these passages show two things.

Firstly, Paul has changed his mind about a "resurrection of the just and unjust," among whom those "which are fallen asleep in Christ" would be in any case resurrected, good or bad, and hence, would not be "perished."

Secondly, it shows that, after all, the immortality attained during life, or life (III), is a completely theoretic affair, of no value in itself ; except as a means to a wholly different kind of "immortality" after death. Paul would not avoid sin merely because of a desire after a purer life. He only struggles to become free from it, he only spreads the Gospel, in order to capture an existence of some kind after death. He goes as far as to say that if it were not for the opportunity of this life (V) he would

recommend eating, and drinking, and comfort in sinning, im-
plicity. "For to-morrow we die."

Belief in this magical connection between faith in the resurrection of Jesus and life (V) is then the logical reason and justification of "baptism for the dead," and this "baptism for the dead" becomes a necessary consequence of this belief. A disuse of this rite would indicate necessarily an abandonment of this belief; or at any rate, a traditionalistic habit of mind which sees sin in thinking clearly.

V. History of Resurrection.—The writer now uses the word "resurrection" in a different sense; resurrection (III), or the resurrection at the last day. This is found in xv : 20-26.

The whole argument advanced is a vague analogy of death coming by one man, and life by another. Then, another analogy of both these circumstances to each life. This disagrees with former descriptions of the life (III) -process taking place in causal connection with the death and resurrection of Jesus, and not with the death of Adam, and the resurrection of Jesus. Again, both resurrections are different.

Firstly, comes the question of the analogy of death coming by one man, and life through another. The nerve of this analogy is then that "manhood" existed in both cases, the latter "man rectifying the mistake of the other "man."

It is capable of proof that this analogy does not hold. The death which Adam brought in was death (I), and this persists in all human beings, since Jesus, and in the case of Jesus himself. What Jesus brought in then was not a correction of the mistake or fault of Adam, but the addition of a totally new order of things, which left the old untouched. Firstly, life (III), which Paul himself acknowledges is worthless in itself. Secondly, life (V) or life (IV), whichever Paul may refer to here, if, indeed, he here still holds his own former distinction.

But Paul himself acknowledges that the resurrection of Jesus did not originate the opinion of the Pharisees, and the resurrections (IV) of the young man of Nain and Lazarus—not speaking of Old Testament resurrections. Hence it may be doubted if he himself is sincere when he says that the resurrection of the dead came by faith in the resurrection of Jesus, as expressed above.

Secondly, it can be shown that the analogy of both events does not hold. It was seen above that what Jesus brought man was an immortality or life (III) which existed during life (I), and on which any future existence depended. Now, the work of Jesus is merely this future existence. The work of Adam is not undone. It is only added to.

Finally, it may be interesting to notice that the resurrection of Jesus, resurrection (IV), and the resurrection of all other persons, resurrection (III).

In the case of Jesus the resurrection took place about thirty hours after death, while the organic body remained intact, and the grave was emptied of the physical body put in it at the burial. In case of resurrection (III) it only takes place "at the

last day," which is an indefinite period, and when by physical experiment it is possible to show that all the physical bodies are absolutely dissolved, and often form part of some new organism. The difference is then exceeding great.

VI. *Submission of the Son.*—It seems to be a part of the writer's conception of the resurrection at the last day, that the Son shall be made wholly subject to "The God," the Father, xv : 27-28. This implies that the Son is not The God, and is subordinated to The God.

VII. *Modus Operandi of Resurrection.*—The manner in which the resurrection takes place is described in xv : 35-38.

The resurrection-body (II) is connected with the natural body by the intermediation of a seed. It is distinctly stated that the natural body must disintegrate wholly, and in some unexplained manner leave behind it the seed of a new one, which indeed is different from the old, being spiritual, whereas the former was "natural." This is the exact doctrine of Tertullian. The latter supposed that the teeth, as the most indestructible parts of man, were the seeds of the spiritual body. But this theory falls to the ground before the fact that even teeth decay and that those of former generations have already long ago disappeared for ever. If this theory were true, the dentist would be a very important personage indeed.

Two remarks may be made concerning this theory.

If it be true that the physical body leaves behind a seed which forms the spiritual body, the strange spectacle would be presented of the seed of one thing giving birth to another. This is equal to gathering grapes of thorns, and figs of thistles.

If, in the second place, it is true that the spiritual body cannot be born until the physical one be dead and decayed, how was it that Jesus rose before the physical organism was thoroughly decayed, as a seed would be, and that he took with him everything that had been laid in the grave, with the exception of the napkins and other external things?

The seed-theory of the resurrection, which is taught by the writer of this Epistle, has some serious difficulties to meet.

VIII. *The Change of the Resurrection.*—How does the actual Resurrection (III) occur? This is told in xv : 39-52.

The main lesson of these lines is that the "physical" flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God. Hence a change is necessary; the seed must die before the plant can live. The whole explanation volunteered by the writer is a description of the fact that a change will suddenly take place. But it does not explain how such a change is possible, under the operation of what laws it takes place, and the like. Simply to affirm that there are many kinds of things,—and among these many things alike, like the flesh of men and beasts—and that there will be a change is not to demonstrate how, when, and why it takes place, and from what to what the change is.

The passage is eloquent, but inconclusive.

IX. *Confusion Between Resurrections.*—After describing the Resurrection "at the last day," without apparent change of ar-

gument of subject, the writer suddenly leaves resurrection (III) and speaks of resurrection (II), in xv : 53-57.

Evidently it does not agree with the foregoing, that the seed must die, and that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, to speak of the mortal part not being done away, but merely putting on a garment, or avoiding sin, and contemplating the law. There is some transition here. The jump is from the "last day" when the "trump" shall sound, to the present day, when only dinner-gongs ring. How then can the former argument apply to so different a thing?

It has been the endeavour of the present writer to distinguish these numerous *quaterniones terminorum* by setting apart separate labels for different connotations. Had Paul done that, his ideas would have flowed methodically, one subject at a time, without repetitions, and he would have probably checked himself in many illicit processes. But he did not; and when it is done, it becomes evident how unclear, unmethodical, chaotic,—though extremely picturesque—all that he says is.

This continual confusion of thought is the reason that this writer's statements are so conflicting, and inconsistent. The only hope is to analyze clearly just what he did mean, and what he was referring to.

X. *Living Resurrection*.—The Second Epistle to the Corinthians refers only to immortality *during* life (I), or, life (III). The quotations refer too plainly to this present order of things, implying in some cases future effort, to permit any mistake as to the period of their application. Such references are i : 9; ii : 14-17; iv : 10-12, 14; v : 1-4, 15, 16.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE RESURRECTION IN THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS.

The reference to the Resurrection in the Epistle to the Galatians is contained in i : 1, 12, 16; ii : 20; 21; vi : 8, 9.

In the first passage, the writer reaffirms that he has seen the resurrected Jesus. The circumstances of the occurrence have already been detailed above.

In the second, the writer takes the extreme position that if morality were possible without "faith" in the resurrection of Jesus, there would have been no use for this. Again in this place the scientific position would have been to investigate whether morality were possible or not by persistent self-direction. Then he would have been in a position to establish accurately the real value of the influence of the resurrection of Jesus.

In the third he distinctly speaks of everlasting life as in connection with life (I). His extreme confusion of thought is shown here by his insisting on well-doing as the essence of righteousness (I), when in the excerpt above salvation was limited to righteousness (II) by imputation, or justification by faith.

CHAPTER IX.

THE RESURRECTION IN THE DEUTERO-PAULINE EPISTLES.

The Soteriology of the Deutero-Pauline Epistles is slightly different from that of the main Pauline Epistles, in insisting a little more strongly on the influence of the Holy Ghost. Not being directly interested in Soteriology, it will be the reader's task to ask himself concerning the assertions of the resurrection of Christ, the nature of the living resurrection, the manner in which this saves man, and the nature of the resurrection at the last day.

I. *Assertions of the Resurrection of Jesus.*—The resurrection of Jesus is insisted on in the Deutero-Pauline Epistles in Eph. i : 20, and i Thess. i : 10.

II. *Nature of Living Resurrection.*—The living resurrection, or immortality, *flie* (III), is the theme of continual discussion, in Eph. ii : 5, 6 ; iv : 16 ; Phil. ii : 16 ; ii : 3 ; III : 10-13 ; Col. ii : 12 ; iii : 3, 4 ; i Tim. vi : 19.

In the above lines it is evident that this immortality is something already attainable before the grave. In fact, in Phil. iii : 10-13 it is implied that it is possible to attain unto the resurrection of the dead in this life, since the writer is fearful lest his readers will think he has already attained, which they would not do if it were impossible, *and out of the question*. Those who share this life have their names inscribed in "the book of life." Even in i Tim. vi : 19 it appears possible before the grave to lay a good foundation of eternal life, although this eternal life does not seem to interfere with death (I).

III. *Soteriology.*—The greatest part of the Soteriology that is relevant to these discussions concerning the Resurrection is contained in ii Tim. i : 10 ; ii : 10-13 ; Titus i : 2, 3 ; iii : 6, 7. Also Col. ii : 11.

What death has Jesus abolished? Certainly not death (I), which is the death that has been known throughout all historic time, and of which men have been afraid. If Jesus abolished death (I) by taking up again the same physical body, it is quite certain that so much cannot be said for any of his disciples whose bodies are not raised as his was.

The fourth passage seems to call life (III) not immortality itself, but only a hope of immortality. Such a meaning would indeed be admissible, and it is possible to explain life (III) under this conception; but it must be said that the greatest part of the statements quoted elsewhere on the subject do not limit themselves to so moderate a view.

IV. *Resurrection at the Last Day.*—The Deutero-Pauline Epistles contain a description of the expected resurrection at the last day, i Thess. iv : 13-17 ; Thess. ii : 1-3.

It is very evident that the writer of the first passage looked forward to the last day during his own life-time. This belief,

however, was only introduced unintentionally, to all appearances. The resurrection of Jesus seems to be looked upon as a guarantee of the resurrection of persons. The difference in the conditions has been pointed out above. The resurrection of Jesus being physical, however, the bodies of the dead were also to rise physically. Besides, it seems that the living were to be caught up together with Jesus and the resurrected dead ; and as the former were physical, so must also the latter be.

The writer seems to have been betrayed in stating that he expected the last day during his own lifetime, in the heat of his enthusiasm of prophetic description. The converts to whom the letter was addressed seem to have noticed that fact, and made much of it. Then the same writer realized his mistake in speaking about the matter, and wrote the second excerpt to endeavour to turn the attention of the Christians from an expectation to the last day to an observance of all the necessary duties of the present. The signs he mentions are to-day, of course, unintelligible ; yet it suffices that the writer expected the last day in a measurably short time. History has shown that that was a mistaken opinion, at best.

CHAPTER X.

THE RESURRECTION IN THE CATHOLIC EPISTLES.

Two main lessons are illustrated in the General or Catholic Epistles. First, the living resurrection, and secondly, its soteriological aspect.

I. The living resurrection is openly treated of, i Jno. iii : 15 ; Jude 21.

II. The soteriological aspect of this living resurrection is touched upon in i : Pet. i : 3-5, 21 ; iii : 16-21.

CHAPTER XI.

THE RESURRECTION ACCORDING TO THE ANTE-NICENE FATHERS.

The Ante-Nicene Fathers touch upon the subject of the Resurrection from time to time. The following lines give a short outline of their doctrine on the subject.

Clement of Rome, Ep. i : 24, seeks to explain the possibility of a return of the body by the analogy of the return of day and night in regular succession ; also the resurrection of the plant from the sowed seed. In i : 25 the example of the phoenix is adduced. Hence, i : 26, the resurrection is not extraordinary "when even by a bird" God "shows us the mightiness of his power." God, i : 27, cannot lie ; hence if he has promised a resurrection, he will fulfill it.

Polycarp, Phil. ii : 5, trusts that God will raise us up as Jesus was raised, if we keep his commandments.

Ignatius, Trall. 9, writes concerning the resurrection, and takes pains to insist on the bodily resurrection when writing to the Smyrnians, 3. Jesus after the resurrection eat and drank with his disciples for forty days, invited handling, and certainly was not incorporeal.

Justin Martyr, in his First Apology, mentions the fact that God raised Jesus, i : 45. He devotes, however, to the subject a separate treatise—if indeed it be his. The objections, de Res. 2, usually advanced against the resurrection, are three : (1) that it is impossible ; (2) that it would entail a return of all weakness and deformities, and (3) if it is a perfect resurrection will entail a resurrection of the sexual organs, which, according to Mark xii : 25, would be useless in an angelic state. To this the answer is, 3, that Jesus did not use the sexual function during his life ; and therefore the righteous may put these organs to better uses than they are naturally put. All the deformed, 4, will rise healed. That it is possible, 5, is proved from the fact that it would seem far more impossible to create the body from a formless drop of sexual secretion, which however is confessedly the case, than to re-form it from pre-existent materials. Besides, man was created from the earth, in the first instance ; this need not make any difficulty, then, in the second. Finally, God is omnipotent.

The doctrine of a resurrection cannot be attacked by the heathen, for Plato, Epicurus, and the Stoics held opinions consistent with it. The flesh is valuable, 6, 7, in the sight of God, hence, it is worthy of a resurrection. The body is a sinner, as well as the soul, 8 ; hence both must be resurrected together. Christ, 9, raised the dead in the flesh, and he himself rose in it, eating, and drinking, and being handled. The resurrection, 10, is of the flesh that died ; hence it is guarded by divine guidance from sins, as it is to be resurrected.

Irenaeus, in the course of his Treatise against all Heresies, touches upon the Resurrection. Christ, iv : v : 2, taught a resurrection. He was incarnated, v : i, and resurrected in order to gain human experience, and become one with man. It is much more difficult, v : iii : 2, to create bones, veins, and nerves, in the first instance, than to reintegrate them when decomposed. So some of the earth will become an eye, an ear, and so forth. The flesh, v : iii : 3, can be a partaker of the power of God as well afterward as to-day. For the earth partakes of life now, in the human body. The lit torch, and the wet sponge, can respectively be lit and wetted again. The prolonged life of the ancient Israelites, v : v, the translation of Elijah and Enoch, the preservation of Jonah, and of the Three Children, proves that God can if he wants raise up physical bodies. So, v : vi, God will raise up both body and soul. As Christ, v : vii, rode in the substance of the flesh, so shall we in our mortal bodies do the same. The impossibility, v : ix, of flesh and blood inheriting the kingdom signifies that not only a part, but the whole of man will be resurrected. The graft, v : x, of the wild olive tree improves it ; so shall the resurrection alter our natures. Sick bodies, v : xii, will be healed in the course of the resurrection.

The highest proof, v : xiii, of the resurrection is the resurrection of Jairus's daughter, the widow of Nain's son and Lazarus. Finally, v : xiii : 5, either Paul contradicted himself, or did not mean the impossibility of the admittance of the flesh into the kingdom to refer to the resurrection of the body. Unless, v : xiv, the flesh was to be saved, the Logos would not have assumed it, and unless he had done this the salvation of man by the atonement could not have taken place. The same God, v: xv, who created, will resurrect. As bodies, v : 16, return to earth, they will have their substance from it. If, v : xviii, the flesh had been imperfect, the Logos would not have assumed it. The preservation, v : xxxi, of bodies is confirmed by the resurrection and ascension of Christ. In the flesh, v : xxxii, in which men have suffered and sinned, shall they be rewarded and punished. Real men, v : xxxvi, must be re-established really.

Hermas has nothing to say concerning the resurrection, as also Cyprian, Gregory Thaumaturgus, and Methodius.

Tatian, ad Graec. 6, states that the resurrection will take place after the restoration of all things, once for all, the disintegrated body, in the meanwhile, being in the storehouse of the Lord, as elements.

Theophilus answers the objection that if, ad Aut. i : 3, even only one case of resurrection should be authenticated, belief might be placed in it, by referring the objector to heathen mythology, in which such strange occurrences are of frequent occurrence. This vital change finds natural analogies in the dying of seasons, days, and nights ; by the natural fructification of a plant from a seed. Besides, in many lives, such a resurrection actually takes place, as when a sick, lean man grows stout by health. The objection that this is due to the kind of food and drink absorbed is met that by the contention that it is just by such means that God works.

Athenagoras devotes a whole treatise to this subject. A resurrection is not impossible unless it be impossible to or against the will of God, 2. He who can create, 3, can also reconstruct. It is possible to suppose that that an element would go through several bodies in rotation and yet return to its original source at last. The objection, 4, of the transference of a particle from being an organic part of one body to that of another, is, 5, shown to be worthless, as it is against "nature" for one human body to assimilate the part of another one, and any such particle must therefore, if it form part of nutrition, be, 6, immediately voided. The new bodies, 7, will be constituted from the same elements as the old, but be incorruptible. Because, 8, anthropophagy is the most hateful deed, human flesh is not a proper food for man. It is absurd, 9, to argue from the impotence of man to that of God, and, 10, it is impossible to show that God does not will a resurrection. As, 11, defence of truth is secondary to proof of it, the end, 12, of man's action is both the use of God, and of the life itself. Hence it is impossible to suppose that man should have been created in vain, namely, to pass away wholly after having been created. The

resurrection, 14, must take place for the sake of just retribution ; but the argument of judgment is not of itself sufficient, as sinless children, who cannot need to undergo it, will rise again. Man, 15, being both body and soul, if he is to be eternal must as much have an eternal body as an eternal soul. The space, 15, of death and dissolution is a period of time intermediary between the two lives, is considered an analogy between two waking states—and therefore is as temporary and as harmless as the other. The drop, 17, of sexual secretion, which develops into a man, has no likeness to him. Hence a resurrection may be possible even from things unlike the body that is to be. Reward, 18, 20-23, and punishment demand both body and soul to be rewarded and punished for their own individual deeds. Unless, 19, some resurrection occurred, with a judgment of reward or punishment, man would be treated by God, in comparison with lower animals, unjustly. For in view of the hope of the resurrection they do not eat, and drink, and enjoy themselves like the animals do. If the former state of life did not exist really, all these self-sacrifices were in vain. Since, 24, everything exists for the sake of some end, 25, the only proper end of body and soul, is a conjoint eternal life of both body and soul.

Tertullian thinks that if, Apol. 48, it is commonly granted by the heathen that a transference of souls from one body into another is not impossible, there is not a much greater presumption in favour of a return of the soul to the very substance restored. For the purposes of judgment, every man must come forth the same that he was while meriting that judgment ; namely, body and soul. It is easier to reconstruct each suffering for itself, than to create it in the first instance. Light and darkness, stars, seasons return ; fruits are reproduced. Shall the lord of these, man, not return also ? After the millenium, the servants of God will be clothed upon with eternity. Their bodies will be indestructible, although sensitive. Mountains, for instance, burn, and last. So shall it be with the wicked. The resurrection will affect the nature of man much more comprehensibly than the best scheme of metempsychosis, ad Nationes i : 19. It is the actual body, c. Marc. 9, which will be resurrected.

What the ceremony of "baptisms" for the dead was, as mentioned in i Cor. xv : Tertullian says he "does not know," but, with a "never mind that," he proceeds to show how it could apply very well to the body, which of itself without the soul is dead, c. Marc. 10. The body that is to be eternal rises from the old as a seed, and is "spiritual." The body must not escape punishment ; shall the cup be punished and the poisoner escape ? Judgment of works done in the body, 12, requires a body.

Tertullian has, himself, written a Treatise on the subject under consideration. With much suggestiveness, he calls it an Essay concerning the Resurrection of the Flesh. He fears that the heathen, 4, vilify the body. Nevertheless, 5, it was created by God before the soul was. The flesh, 6, however, is only worthy because of God's skill that was employed in fashioning it. It, in fact, 7, becomes the chief work of creation. Christianity, 8,

puts the highest honour on it. The flesh, 9, is the best means possible of exhibiting the bounty of God. God is fully powerful enough, 11, to effect its resurrection. The body will return, because, 12, the light, the sun, the moon, the stars, the seasons, and fruits return. Tertullian sees in the Greek word meaning a "palm-tree," Ps. xcii, 12, a reference to the fabulous bird called a Phoenix, which of course is a proof of human resurrection, 15. Judgment, 14, 15, 56, demands the presence of both soul and body. The Body, 16, is responsible for its own deeds, and, 17, as well as the soul, will be punished and rewarded. Tertullian goes out of his way to question Paul's doctrine on the subject, affirming it to be an error to believe that the "resurrection of the dead," 19, means the moral change of a new life. He does not believe, 20, that all of the Scriptures is written in a figurative style, so the resurrection, 22, only takes place at the last day. Paul's "spiritual resurrection" is, 23, combatible with, and, in fact implied in the physical resurrection. Paul, elsewhere, 24, and John, 25, distinctly assert the resurrection of the flesh. A bodily resurrection, 26, alone furnishes significance to the so-called spiritual resurrection, 29, Ezekiel's vision of the reanimation of dry bones supports a resurrection of the flesh itself, 30. Even unburied bodies, 32, will be restored. Christ, 33-38, teaches such a physical resurrection, and, 38, gives practical evidence of it in the cases of the persons he raised from the dead. Teeth, 42, and bones, especially the former are "the lasting germs of that body which is to sprout into life again at the Resurrection." Paul's apparent disagreement, 43-49, with a doctrine so physical, can be explained. Works of the flesh, 50, and not the flesh itself, are excluded from the kingdom. The session of Jesus, 51, at the right hand of God assures the believer of the entrance of actual flesh into heaven. The new body, 52, rises from the old as from a seed. Not the soul, 53, but the natural body which died is to rise again. The bodies, 57, which die mutilated will rise again healed. The manumitted slave is no more liable to the sufferings of the whip. Hence, 58, comes comfort and peace in contemplation of the resurrection. Man, 59, being made for the dispensation of man, the flesh will remain the same, but be capable of bearing the changed conditions of eternal life. As, 60, the repaired ship remains the same, so the characteristics, sex, and organs of the body will remain the same, although the function of the latter may possibly be altered. 61. Sexual functions in themselves are honourable enough. The resurrection will induce in the body a likeness to the angels, as men are destined to be equal to the latter. "The" 63, "flesh shall rise again in its own identity, in its absolute integrity." The soul shall never be permitted to remain naked and homeless. Apparent extinction is only temporary retirement. The Holy Ghost teaches this doctrine in order to comfort the afflicted saint.

Minucius Felix, Oct. 34, holds that as God can form, so can he reconstruct. What is withdrawn from human sight is not necessarily perished to God. Everything that has been dis-

solved is in the elements in a state of solution. Natural analogies of the resurrection, and proofs of the above, are the rising and sinking of the sun, the passing and returning of the stars, the flowers dying and reviving, the seeds rotting before sprouting. As the leaves on a tree show forth the springtime of a tree, so must the Christian await the spring-time of the body. Punishments and rewards, 35, will demand the presence of the body.

Origen, *de Princ.* i : 2 : 4, notes the fact that Jesus is given the title, "the Resurrection," as a mark of perfection. This resurrection, ii : 11, 4, gives knowledge of divine truth. Bodies, ii : 10 : 1, are necessary for a covering of the soul, and therefore when bodies are given to souls after death, it is advisable that the former should be their own, and not coverings belonging to other souls. The spirituality of the resurrection-body consists of being incorruptible, so as not to have to die a second time. The shape, ii : 10 : 2, of the spiritual body is that of the natural body. The earthly body, ii : 10 : 5, falls into the earth like a seed of grain, "that germ being implanted in them" (the bodies) "which contains the bodily substance." The degree of the glory of the resurrection-body will depend directly on that of the soul. The eternal spiritual body, iii : 6 : 4, will probably be invisible, as it is only the invisible things which are eternal. Although the resurrection-body will be refined to a high degree of splendour, yet it will be the identical body.

The flesh, *c. Cels.* i : 14, is to exist forever. The body, i : 19, will rise from the old as from a seed. The dead, vi : 29, will not be raised with the same flesh and blood; the new "matter" belonging to the "natural" body, will be spiritual. A seminal principle, vii : 32, is implanted in the soul. No soul exists without a body; hence it receives a better vesture after losing the grosser.

Lactantius, *Div. Inst.* iv : 19, asserts that Jesus was resurrected in the identical body that was laid in the grave. The soul, vii : 23, will rise again and be clothed upon with a spiritual body. As Pythagoras, Chrysippus, and Cicero believe in a kind of resurrection in the nature of a transmigration of souls, there is no need, for the Christian apologist, to explain how a resurrection can take place. At the judgment of God, vii : 26, the righteous who will then be on the earth will be hid in caves until the time of distress is overpast. Then they will be transformed into the similitude of angels, white as snow; then a second public resurrection of the wicked, in order to hand them over to punishment, will take place.

The Apostolic Constitutions, v : i : 7, aver that after the Resurrection men will be in their present form, only without defect or corruption, shining like stars. Both righteous and unrighteous will have a share in the Judgment. The Sybils predicted this long since, and the Phoenix proved it. God is omniscient and omnipotent; and it is easier to reconstruct than to create. He is faithful to his promises, and Jesus, who per-

formed the many miracles reported in the Gospels will assuredly raise us up.

Hippolytos—or some pseudo-Hippolytos—mentions a resurrection of the body, by adducing texts in point, *de Christ. et Antich.* 65. The kind of body, c. Plat. 2, will depend on the merits of the soul, and it will arise out of the old body as a seed. The unrighteous shall receive their old bodies unchanged, and the righteous will receive their bodies healed. 3, Fire unquenchable, with unimaginable torments, awaits the wicked.

Arnobius, c. Gent. 14, refuses to consider any objections to the Resurrection on the ground that Plato's scheme of transmigration, which is generally accepted without question, contains as many, if not more incongruities. Eternal punishment is annihilation.

So much for the arguments of the Ante-Nicene Fathers for the Resurrection.

When they are scrutinized, it appears that in the whole mass of considerations, there are only two arguments, added to Biblical quotations. The first is the natural analogy of the setting and rising of the heavenly bodies, the return of the seasons, and the like. The second is the necessity for judgment.

The analogy of the rising and setting of the stars, heavenly bodies; the return of the seasons, fruits, and the like, is of course invalid. All these are facts of experience; and from this experience have been formulated. The resurrection, however, has no single case of experience, in present times, to vouch for it. Besides, such an event would flatly contradict all the natural laws which have been discovered by experience.

This is the place to examine the fatal objection which seems to have been thrown into the face of every apologist. If every particle of matter of the old body returns to compose the new, what will occur if a particle belongs to two bodies, by accidental eating of the one by the other? Augustine decided it would belong to the original body; but the result to the second would be disastrous. The earlier Fathers, however, had not achieved this degree of mental subtlety. They contented themselves with asserting that anthropophagy, chronic or acute, was "against nature," and that therefore any particle which would enter a body would not be assimilated, but immediately voided. Of course this argument is useless; savages fatten off their victims; so it is good proof that such particles are assimilated by human organisms. In any case such an argument is a circle. The very fact of such a proceeding being "against nature"—as much as it comes natural to certain bushmen—depends on the particles not being assimilated.

Yet an argument which was not brought against the apologist of physical resurrection of those days is very plain to-day. It has been ascertained that the natural metabolism of the body changes every single particle of matter in a human body once every seven years, at least. Consequently, the question arises, Which body will be resurrected, for in reality at every moment some change forms a new body? Who shall decide which body

shall be resurrected ? If the body that died is to be resurrected, it would on the whole be an advantage to suicide while still young, in order to remain young all eternity.

It remains to be asked, also, in how far is a body, which is so different from the old one, as to be incorruptible, immortal, the same body with one that is corruptible, and mortal ? The very essence of life is instability ; and to eliminate this element is to eliminate all that constitutes a human body. The resurrection-body can then not be the same body, except in shape, possibly. It is not the same body ; it is a different body with the same shape.

The characteristic Patristic argument, however, is a new one, and deserving of attention. The premisses are, that a body or soul can only be adequately recompensed for good or evil until they be in the same condition in which they originally were. Hence, the soul must again be in the body. But if this premiss be followed out to its full conclusion, a different result will be obtained. Adequate retribution can only exist under the same circumstances in which the good or evil was committed. The body, of course, is not responsible, being un-moral, physical. But the soul must be in the same position it was, not only in respect to the body, but also in respect to the world. The identity of the particles matters but little ; but the identity of the conditions under which punishment or reward are to be attained must be the same and those under which the merit or guilt was earned, is extremely significant. Hence, this argument, does not lead to an eternity of misery, or an irreversible idle happiness, but a re-incarnation in the same world the merit or guilt was won, under such conditions as by God are considered suitable to reward, or punish, or teach deeper sanctification. The result is not then what is understood usually by resurrection of the body, but a re-incarnation in the world.

And indeed, when the doctrine of Metempsychosis is framed judiciously, leaving in God's hands the adjustment of circumstances exactly just, is furnishes the only valid or convincing argument against suicide. For then the period of incarnation is a great benefit, and not to be escaped from ; hence it teaches resignation to present circumstances, by pointing out the hope of justice, both as a doctrine, and as an intuition in the human breast.

Beyond these two arguments, the Ante-Nicene Fathers content themselves to repeat the Biblical statements on the questions involved ; not scrupling to use many Old Testament utterances, even when, as with Tertullian, the illustration is in the anture of a pun.

CRITICAL ESSAYS

ON

THE TWO CREEDS

AND

THE LAMBETH ARTICLES.

Kenneth S. Seward Guthrie.



THE APOSTLES' CREED.

Church History has perhaps no greater surprise, or changes the conception of the lay mind in nothing more than that the Apostles' Creed, in the form in which it is used to-day, is not older than Pirminius, A. D. 758, or 433 years after the formulation of the Nicene Creed. It is customary to consider the former the more original Creed, and the latter the younger ; but, in point of fact, the relation is reversed.

Symbololatry is but a thing of to-day. Creeds until the time of Pirminius were effects, not causes. They were the natural outgrowth of the living faith of the Churches, and varied with the life of the Church. In other words, the Church was the measure, the cause of the Creed. To-day, the case is reversed. The life of the Church is the outgrowth of the Creed, and the Church is unprogressive, having crystallized around one single form of the Creed. In other words, the Creed is the measure, the cause of the Church.

I. Within a few years Professor Harnack has written a pamphlet bearing on the history of the Creed commonly referred to as the Apostles' Creed. Mrs. Humphrey Ward translated it into English, but in its new dress it has not become so popular as it deserved to be. A short outline of its main arguments will therefore not be out of place.

The basis of the present Apostles' Creed, is the Roman Creed, although more directly the formulary of to-day descends from the Gallican form, which seems to have been based on the former.

The Roman Creed is as follows :

“ I believe in God the Father Almighty. And in Jesus Christ, his only Son, our Lord ; Who was born by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, crucified under Pontius Pilate, and buried. The third day he rose again from the dead, ascended into heaven, sitteth at the right hand of the Father, whence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead.

And in the Holy Ghost, the Holy Church, the remission of sins, the resurrection of the flesh.”

The Gallican Creed reads as follows :

“ I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth :

And in Jesus Christ his only Son our Lord : Who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, Born of the Virgin Mary, Suffered under Pontius Pilate, Was crucified, dead and buried : He descended into hell ; The third day he rose again from the

dead : He ascended into heaven, And sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty :

From thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead.

I believe in the Holy Ghost : The holy Catholic Church, The Communion of Sainst : The Forgiveness of sins, The resurrection of the Flesh : And the Life everlasting."

The African Creed had, in the latter clauses, the following alteration : "The Life everlasting through through the holy Church."

The reason that these Creeds were called Apostolic, is well rendered by Pirminius, who recounts at leisure the myth that at Pentecost each of the disciples spontaneously uttered as exclamations one or several of the clauses. This Apostolic origin must have been a Roman innovation, Rufinus, and Ambrose setting it forth at length. But nevertheless the idea cannot have been old, because many provincial Churches recited creeds derived from the form given above, but differing from it. The omission of clauses cannot be traced with certainty.

The Roman formulary appears to have been in use from A. D. 250-460 ; the Gallican form can be traced to Southern Gaul, in the year A. D. 450. The probabilities are that it was descended from the Roman formulary, with the evident additions. Yet the Roman form was probably originated at least by 150 A. D., for it had spread all over the West a short while after. While it lived in the provincial Churches, it died out in Rome itself after A. D. 460. The reason of this was that the Nicene formulation, or rather the Epiphanian Creed, was used in opposition to the Arian barbarians. Then, in Rome itself the French form was introduced, because the Pope was later under the domination of the French. Then the doctrine of Apostolic origin was revived, and applied to the new developed Gallico-Roman formulary. From Gaul came also the so-called "Athanasian Creed," so that France is really responsible for both formularies.

Nevertheless, the Gallico-roman form remained elastic till A. D. 750, under the hands of Pirminius, and showed how great an enlargement the Baptismal formula was susceptible of.

Dr. Harnack contends that even the earliest form of the Roman Creed to which we have access contained articles of belief in excess of th Apostolic teaching. Such are the miraculous conception, the ascension, and the resurrection of the flesh. Again, the reader must be careful not to import into the simple language of the Creed Nicene and Post-Nicene conceptions, in respect to the Fatherhood of God, the Sonship of Jesus, and the Personality of the Holy Ghost. The descent into hell, and the communion of saints does not even appear in the earliest Roman form.

The arguments of Dr. Harnack in respect to the miraculous conception are as follows :

(1). Notice of it is wanting in all the Epistles of the New Testament.

(2). Certainly not to be found in Mark and John.

(3). Not in original Matthew and Luke.

(4). Genealogies are inconsistent, but agree in leading back to Joseph, not Mary.

(5). Jesus proclaimed himself Messiah only at the time of his baptism by John. The ascension does not belong to primitive tradition because not to be found in the three-fold Synoptic record.

The resurrection of the flesh, it is true, is found in respect of Jesus ; but otherwise the passages I Cor. xv : 50, and John vi : 63, are decisive against it for general resurrection.

In respect to the Fatherhood of God, Dr. Harnack contends the Creed referred to nothing more than to a general Fatherhood, of the Universe, such as belongs to a Creator. All that the Gospels say of the nature of the Son is Matth. xi : 27 and Luke x : 22. The "Lord" means Redeemer, and "only Son" refers to eternal Sonship only after Council of Nicaea. The "Son" is the Jesus of history. Since the clause in respect to the Holy Ghost is not defined, the Holy Ghost should not be looked upon so much as a Person, as a Power and Gift. The "Spirit of God" is God himself.

As to the Descent into hell, this clause is first found in the creed of Aquileia and Sirmium, A. D. 359. It is otherwise found only rarely, and with many differing interpretations. The Communion of Saints is never found in Greek. First, in Faustus of Reii, who believed in a worship of saints ; and in Augustine of Hippo, "with the perfected saints."

II. Such are the negative facts to which Professor Harnack draws attention. Dr. Swete in his "The Apostles' Creed : its relation to Primitive Christianity" explicitly sets himself to refute Dr. Harnack's claims. It is interesting to notice what his plea will be.

First in order, it may be worth while to give a passing glance at the general aspect of the book, as affording an insight into the habits of Dr. Swete. Of course, its scholarliness, and style is irreproachable ; but it is noticeable that in the Creeds Dr. Swete gives at the end of his book not one is provided with a date. Since the main object of the book is to show the early period of certain doctrines, it might be expected that his chronology would be explicit ; but perhaps he did not add them because the dates of all of them would be very late. Besides, just as if nothing had been done on the subject for the last twenty years, he prints at length the Epiphanian Creed under the caption of "Creed of Constantinople," as if the Council of Constantinople had adopted any Creed at all, let alone the Epiphanian.

Dr. Swete does not grasp the historical method which Dr. Harnack employs. The historian is not concerned to prove that there is no testimony to deny that a certain doctrine

was held at an early date, although possessing no objective proof. The historian's business is to gather objective facts, and to make deductions from them, without any regard to consequences arising therefrom. Theology may then accommodate itself to history, not history to theology. Dr. Swete seems to be at pains to show that it is with him a question of doctrine that historical facts are such or such. His persistent method is to hold as much as the facts of history can be tortured into bearing, besides, at times, taking facts for granted, which make for him, without examining them : as, for instance, in respect to the "Creed of Constantinople," mentioned above. Instead of acknowledging the full significance of negative facts which make against him, and which he cannot deny, he ignores them.

Dr. Swete answers the *ex silentio* arguments in respect to the Miraculous Conception in the following words : " Much has been made of the silence of St. Mark, but the argument *ex silentio* was never more conspicuously misplaced ; it is puerile to demand of a record which professes to begin with the Ministry of the Baptist that it shall mention an event which preceded the Baptist's birth. The plan of the Fourth Gospel equally excludes a reference to the manner of our Lord's entrance into this world. It would have been a departure from St. Paul's plan, if he had directly referred to the fact of the Conception." But Dr. Swete does not seem to realize that the writers of the Gospels and the Epistles did not write with any other "plan" or "purpose" than to give an account, full, and convincing of the life and teaching of the Master. Consequently, so great a miracle could not have been omitted, unless it was not known. Neither the Second nor the Fourth Gospel could have begun only with his baptism, if the Miraculous conception was known to the writers. The fact is that a Miraculous conception is a Miracle so astounding, so absolutely unique, so absolutely contradictory to all other experience of all races in all times, that if it occurred it would have been the one most noticeable thing of the life of Jesus, overshadowing everything of his healing or teaching except his own resurrection. Dr. Swete refers to a Miraculous Conception as if it were an every day affair of which nobody would take much notice, and which might possibly be recounted as a minor detail of the life of Jesus by fond disciples years after the life and death of Jesus. If the Miraculous conception is true at all, it is the one great miracle of the life of Jesus and no complete account of his life and teaching could be given without a reference to it.

But Dr. Swete has no fear of logical self-contradiction. "On the other hand, no adverse conclusion can fairly be drawn from Rom. I : 3, 'made of the seed of David according to the flesh,' as if the words asserted the paternity of Joseph. Ignatius more than once combines in the same sentence the Davidic descent with the Virgin birth." Dr Swete

seems to think that if Ignatius' mind was illogical enough to combine two contradictory things in one sentence, all other minds should be so too. The case is plain : both genealogies of Davidic descent lead to Joseph, not Mary. If then there was Davidic descent, Joseph was father of the Child ; if the Child was virginborn, it was not the child of Joseph, and through him of David. The words of Paul seem to be decisive against Dr. Swete.

Dr. Swete may well say that "the narrative of the Conception in the first Gospel is absolutely independent of the narrative in the third." He does not mention that the two genealogies contradict each other, both however professing to lead to Joseph, not Mary. "Even if it should appear that in the original Matthew the Genealogy ended with the Formula 'Joseph begat Jesus,' the words would no more be a denial of the miracle than S. Luke's references to Joseph as the 'Father' and to Joseph and Mary as the 'parents' of the Lord." It would only remove the last shred of objective evidence of the miracle, and leave all objective denials of it in plain sight.

On one page Dr. Swete says that the Protevangelium of Luke "betrays unmistakeably—an independent origin ;" on another he says : "one an integral part of the Third Gospel."

Which of these two statements does Dr. Swete intend to abide by ? Hypotheses are cheap : the differing Protevangelium may have been written before, but it may also have been written after ; no argument should therefore be drawn from this source. The only question that presents itself is the following : if the writer of the third Gospel was not able, when introducing into his Gospel the Protevangelium, to re-write it, and eliminate all the bad Greek, why could he so successfully manipulate all the rest of his material, which makes a perfect unity in the Gospel ? In the Introduction the writer professes nothing more than to compile from earlier Gospels ; and his handling of the material of the First Gospel's "Sermon on the Mount" showed what a masterly compiler he was. Why did he become suddenly unable to correct grammar, and style, when he met the Protevangelium ? The only inference can be that some other hand than his inserted the section under discussion. This is so much the more likely as the Synoptic tradition seems to begin with the Baptism, in all three Gospels ; the First Gospel begins with the Baptism as if it began a separate writing.

Dr. Swete concedes Dr. Harnack's contention, that the Conception does not belong to the earliest Gospel preaching, if the words are restricted to their narrowest sense. But if the Miraculous Conception was a fact, it is impossible that the Twelve could hope to give any kind of an account of the life and mission of Jesus without mentioning such an unique, unheard of, marvellous fact. In the Acts of the Apostles, when the Apostles speak of Jesus in their preaching, they

never mention it, as they must have done, had they known of so great a marvel.

Concerning the Ascension, Harnack claims that it is not mentioned by the Synoptists, or by St. Paul in his Creed-like summary of the Faith (I Cor. XV : 3 ff.), or by the chief sub-apostolic writers. Dr. Swete answers this *ex silentio* argument in the same manner as above. Putting aside acknowledged interpolations, Dr. Swete claims the Ascension did not fall within the proper scope of the Gospels. Strange, that so marvelous an occurrence, that a body which could be felt and could eat should fly up into space in the very teeth of the law of gravitation, should be held so little miraculous by the Synoptists, that they should omit to mention the occurrence, especially if the places in their Gospels were so well fitted to tell the story that interpolators should add it ! Why should not the crowning event of a man's life fall within the scope of an account of his life ? As to S. Paul, Swete thinks that if he had added a notice of the Ascension it would have been superfluous and misleading—and this to a "creed-like summary of the Faith ! " The omission is so unaccountable, because the place is so easily amplified by the addition of a single word. Dr. Swete does not understand that if the Ascension is true at all, it is a miracle of so astounding a nature as to make any account of the life work of Jesus which did not mention it hopelessly incomplete. As to the chief sub-apostolic writers, "what reason is there to expect them to touch upon the subject of the Ascension ?" The fact that it is the greatest miracle of the life of Jesus, and if it had been known and believed, so many Christian apologists and writers could not have omitted it any more than the Resurrection of Jesus, which, on the whole, is not so great a miracle as the Ascension.

Dr. Swete scores one point against Dr. Harnack. "In some of the oldest accounts the Resurrection and the sitting at the right hand of God are taken as parts of the same act, without the mention of any Ascension." Texts from the New Testament disprove this assertion.

In respect to the last argument, that "in the Epistle of Barnabas both Resurrection and Ascension happen in one day," both Dr. Harnack and Dr. Swete are at fault. Dr. Swete shows that Barnabas' words may be interpreted so as to allow of an interval; which, however, he confesses does contradict the Acts. He refuses to accept the witness of some Valentinians which Dr. Harnack adduces, without sufficient grounds. Besides he is forced to acknowledge that the statement of the Acts must be taken with great latitude.

In respect to the Resurrection of the flesh Dr. Swete is forced to concede that there is no biblical authority for it, except a Septuagint version of Job, a passage applied in the New Testament only to the resurrection of Jesus. Paul continually speaks of a resurrection of the dead, or of the body ; not of the flesh.

The historical method, which Harnack represents, denies everything which facts do not affirm ; Dr. Swete, on the contrary, affirms everything which he is not forced to deny. The contrast is interesting. "But if the phrase does not appear within the limits of the Canon, 'we can hardly doubt that from the very earliest times the resurrection of the flesh as preached by a few Christians, but it was not a universal doctrine.' It would have been more exact to say that while the doctrine was in substance universally taught, the phrase seems to have been unknown in the earliest times." Dr. Swete may be asked, what proof have you of this ? Especially in view of the fact Paul distinctly avoids the expression ? Harnack's position is the most exact. Barnabas and Clement of Rome hold to a resurrection of the body ; Ignatius asserts only a resurrection of the flesh of Jesus. Justin knows not of it. Tertullian, Methodius and Jerome are the first to preach it. Origen opposes it. Rufinus improved on Jerome by adding "this" to "flesh," to be quite definite on the subject. The Epiphanian Creed does not contain "of the flesh," nor, according to Dr. Hort, do any "revised Eastern creeds" contain it.

Dr. Swete, does not care to concede Dr. Harnack is right, although the evidence he adduces proves it. He contents himself with showing that the Anglican Church professes all three forms together—certainly a logical way out of the difficulty !

III. A Creed is a statement of necessary doctrine, gleaned out from the great body beliefs which a man may hold. What is not contained in a Creed is then matter of opinion, which a man may hold or not, according to his pleasure and insight. It is interesting to notice therefore what doctrines were in earlier times considered matters of opinion, although in latter days they came to be considered necessary doctrine.

Comparing the Roman Creed with its Gallican development, it appears that the following doctrines were in Rome at least considered matters of opinion. This will appear more plainly from a consideration of later additions.

- (1). Creator of heaven and earth.
- (2). "Conceived of Holy Ghost."
- (3). "suffered,"
- (4). "dead,"
- (5). "descended into hell."
- (6). "Father Almighty."
- (7). Catholic Church, Communion of Saints, eternal life.

The increase of doctrine may appear still more patent if, following the footsteps of J. Rawson Lumby in his History of the Creeds, we compare the Creeds of Cyprian, A. D. 250, and Novatian, A. D. 260, with that of Marcellus, A. D. 341, which is the next creed in chronological order, and just after the Nicene Crede.

The creed of Cyprian runs as follows.

"I believe in God the Father ; In Christ his Son ; In the Holy Ghost within the Holy Church, the Remission of sins, and eternal Life."

The creed of Novatian is the following.

"I believe in God the Father ; In Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the Lord of God ; and in the Holy Spirit."

Next in order is the nearest post-Nicene formulation, that of Marcellus.

"I believe in God Almighty ; in Jesus Christ his only-begotten Son our Lord ; being born of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary, crucified under Pontius Pilate, and buried ; he rose on the third day from the dead : ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father, whence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead. And in the Holy Ghost, the Holy Church, the Remission of sins, the Resurrection of the flesh, and the Life eternal."

This creed has the following additions to the Nicene Creed, and consequently to that of Cyprian and Novatian :

- (1). Being born of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary.
- (2). Crucified under Pontius Pilate, and was buried.
- (3). And sitteth on the right hand of the Father.
- (4). The Holy Church, the Remission of sins, the Resurrection of the Flesh, and the Life eternal.

Looking back to the additions to the Nicene Creed, found in the Epiphanian Creed, called by the Fathers of Chalcedon the "Creed of the 150," the strange fact appears that almost the same additions to the creeds of Cyprian and Marcellus are found in that of Marcellus, which are added to the Nicene symbol by the Epiphanian. There can only be one conclusion : that shortly after the Council of Nicaea, perhaps sixteen years after it, there arose a popular craze for symbolic definitions ; and that as a consequence of this the opinions concerning the Virgin Birth, the Crucifixion, the Death, the Session, and of the additions to the last clause were incorporated into the Creed, and considered dogmatic definitions.

This does not mean that these doctrines had never been held before ; or that before this time they had not been found in the Gospels. But it seems that only at this time were they added to the Christian statement of faith as necessary articles of belief.

If, however, the Nicene Creed is a sufficient statement of the Christian faith, as the Lambeth Articles declare, then it is evident that these later additions to both the Nicene and the Apostolic formulations must be omitted from what should be considered necessary parts of the Christian's faith. This does not deny that these facts may be found in the Gospels. It only points out the fact that they are not essentials of faith. They are non-essentials, beautiful, and blessed ; but not to be demanded of any.

THE NICENE CREED.

1.—*The Nicene Creeds.*—The presence of Athanasius at the Council of Nicaea, and the condemnation of Arianism, were of such moment to the doctrinal history of the Church, that ever since then it has been considered a universal test of orthodoxy to abide by the decision and Creed of that Council. The Church asserts this, but gives another Creed in place of the Creed of Nicaea in the Prayer Book. The rubrics concerning it shed light on the question.

The first two Rubrics, p. 12, and 25, are completely non-committal, and merely order "this" to be recited. The Church has full right to order any formulary it may set forth to be recited, only referring to it as "this." Such is the case, for instance, with the General Confession.

But when we consider the Rubric on p. 224, the circumstances are different. It is here distinctly set forth that the formulary which follows is a Creed, and to be recited, and believed as a Creed. It becomes therefore important to know what Creed it is which is to be recited. As long as the worshipper does not know that the formulary which follows is not the Creed of Nicaea, no difficulty occurs. But as soon as this fact is known, it is necessary to ask, What Creed, then, is this? The answer is, Not the Nicene Creed, but, "the Creed commonly called the Nicene." Yet the rubric proceeds, "Provided that the Nicene Creed"—therefore not the "Creed commonly called the Nicene"—"shall be said—" The Rubric therefore speaks of two distinct Creeds: "the Creed commonly called the Nicene," and "the Nicene Creed." It is desirable that in pursuance of this Rubric the actual "Nicene Creed" should be printed at length for the benefit of the clergy and people on Christmas-day, Easter-day, Ascension-day, Whit-Sunday, and Trinity-Sunday. This is the meaning of the actual words of Rubric.

Either the Rubric refers to two distinct formularies, or only to one.

If it refers to two separate formularies, the actual Nicene Creed should be printed below, for use on the Holy Days mentioned.

If it refers to one single formulary, then there is a historical blunder in the Rubric, for the Nicene Creed differs from the "Creed commonly called the Nicene."

The only way to avoid the dilemma is to deny history, for which proceeding, however, it is too late in the course of civilization.

The Nicene Creed, as given by Sokratēs, is as follows :

“ We believe in one God, Father Almighty, the Maker of all things visible and invisible ;

And in one Lord Christ, the Son of the God ; born only-begotten of the Father, that is, from the being of the Father ; God of God, light of light, very God of very God ; born, not made, consubstantial with the Father, through whom all things in heaven and earth arose ; for us men and for our salvation he descended, and was incarnated and became man ; he suffered and rose on the third day, he ascended into heaven, and will come to judge the quick and the dead.

And I believe in the Holy Ghost.”

2. *Traditionalistic Plea.*—This historical fact of the difference between these two formularies has been known more or less clearly for some time past. It was smoothed over by assuming as a fact that the later formulary was the same as the earlier, only expanded, and amplified. The consequence was that it is not wrong to substitute the later, fuller, form for the earlier, tentative expression of it.

Bishop Wordsworth refers to the matter in the following words, *Hist. of the Church*, Vol. II, p. 332 : “ The Council ” (Constantinople, A. D. 381) “ agreed, without a dissentient voice, as far as we know, in the following determinations :—

1. To confirm the faith of Nicaea in precisely the same words as those in which it was originally put forth in A. D. 325.

2. To add to that Creed some words declaratory of the doctrine of the Holy Scripture, and the Church, in opposition to the Apollinarian heresy.

3.—(To add some declaration concerning the) “ Godhead of the Holy Ghost in opposition to the Macedonian heresy.”

Besides Bishop Wordsworth, two well-known writers have touched the question, Dr. Bright, and Dr. Fulton. Their words are given below.

(Bright, William D. *Notes on the Canons of the First Four General Councils*. Oxford, Clarendon Press. p. 80.)

But here a question arises. The Council of Chalcedon ascribes to this Council of Constantinople and under the name of ‘the 150 fathers,’ (Mansi vii. 109), that Recension of the Nicene Creed which has practically superseded the original form, with the restoration of the Nicene phrase ‘God from God’ in East and West alike, and with the additional of the ‘Filioque’ and the change of ‘and’ into ‘of’ before the name of Mary, in the West only. But is this statement compatible with the formal ratification of the Nicene Creed in the Canon now before us ? It may be answered that the members of the Council of A. D. 381 would not consider themselves to be in any sense invalidating, but rather confirming and per-

petuating, the formulary of A. D. 325, when they adopted, with hardly any change, a development of it which had been embodied just eight years previously in the *Ancoratus* of Epiphanius, and therein described as the Creed of the Church, set forth by 'bishops more than 310 in number' (Ancor. 120, 121). This creed was in effect the Nicene confession expanded, in view of present doctrinal requirements, by means of material borrowed from what might be called the Creed of Jerusalem, as it may be collected from the Catechetical Lectures of Cyril delivered in 347 or 348. It may seem strange that Epiphanius should use such language respecting a formulary which was not *verbatim* identical with the Nicene:—but he is not to be judged by our notions of accuracy, and it is, on the other hand, practically incredible, that he should not have known the wording of the Nicene Symbol itself, which had been solemnly exhibited, as accepted by 3 Semi-Arian deputies, before an orthodox Council at Tyania, in Cappadocia, 6 years before he wrote his *Ancoratus* in Cyprus for a Church in Pamphilia. C. Cp. Basil Epist. 226, 3 : 244, 7. Sok. vi. 12. It is true that these deputies, in their letter to Liberius, alter the Nicene wording in one clause of the creed, so as to read, 'And in one Only-begotten God, the Lord Jesus Christ' Sok. iv. 12: but for the rest they commit their 64 brethren to that wording. And if any of the prelates at Constantinople could have taken this 'Epiphanian' Symbol for the Nicene in a literal sense, Gregory of Nyssa, whose brother, S. Basil, had embodied the Creed of 35 (omitting *Theon ek theou*) in a letter to the Antiochene Church, written on 373 (Epist. 142.2), or Pelagius of Laodicea or Zeno of Tyre (cf. Mansi, iii, 568), who had sat in the Synod of Tyania, could have at once corrected the mistake, and shown in what sense the Symbol could be called the Nicene—a sense sufficient for that purpose, although it might fail to satisfy a modern standard of precision. It is remarkable that Basil, 377, had written to Epiphanius, to the effect that 'not the smallest addition' could be made to the Nicene Creed, except on the divinity of the Holy Spirit; some proposed additions on the Incarnation he had declined even to consider (Epist. 288. 2). On both these points the 'Epiphanian' creed contained additions which the Council, according to the received opinion, saw reason to adopt: What again been objected that between the years 381 and 451 this recension of the Creed which we call the Constantinopolitan, is never alluded to, in other words, no 'Creed of the Second Council' appears to have been known; Sokratēs says merely that the Nicene Creed was 'confirmed' (v. 8). The Western churches, the Alexandrian church, the Council of Ephesus, the Antiochene party opposed to that Council (comp. Mansi, iv. 1341, 1375,) recognize the original Nicene Creed and no other (cp. Lumby Hist of Creeds, p. 72). But the authority of the Council of Constantinople itself was ignored by the West and by Egypt (see Neale, Hist. Alex. i. 209, Le Quien, Or. Chr. ii.

405): the Council of Ephesus was largely under the influence of the great prelate whom his enemies called the 'Egyptian': and the Syrian Churches, however keenly opposed to 'Apolinarianising' tendencies, might not have had occasion to consider or adopt the recension before us, which in one passage, relating to the Nativity, bears tokens of hostility to Apolinarian mysticism. At any rate, none of the bishops at Chalcedon appear to have challenged the assertion of the imperial commissioners that 'the 150' made an 'ekthesis' of the faith (Mansi, vi, 937); and when in the next Session the same commissioners caused the present Creed to be read as what 'the 150' had thus put forth, 'all the bishops exclaimed, This is the faith of all' (Mansi, vi, 957): and the whole Council, in its Fifth Session, solemnly adopted it as forming, with the original Nicene Creed, a 'wise and salutary Symbol' (Mansi vii, 112). It was quite possible in ancient times for persons to be religiously attached to the Nicene formulary, and yet to use, side by side with it, some other formulary agreeing with it in doctrine, but not altogether in language,—as was probably the case with Charisius (see below on Eph. 7), and certainly with Gregory of Tours, who prefixes to his 'Historia Ecclesiastica Francorum,' a 'creed' of his own as 'quod in Ecclesia credi praedicatur.'

(John Fulton, *The Chalcedonian decree*, p. 97.) "The Seventh Canon of Ephesus is generally but erroneously supposed to have set forth the Nicene Declaration as a creed in the strict sense of the word, but, as a creed, we have clearly seen that the Nicene Declaration would have been defective in several important particulars; and if the Fathers of Ephesus had intended to establish a creed for universal use, they would hardly have forgotten the Declaration of Constantinople, which would have perfectly answered that end. In what they did they followed the invariable example of their predecessors. They went no further than the matters before them required that they should go. In those matters they had found the Nicene Declaration to be sufficient and satisfactory, and they therefore enacted, first, that it should thenceforward be an ecclesiastical offence to compile or compose any doctrinal statement which should be inconsistent with that Declaration; and Second, that to offer or propound any such statement to any person desiring to enter the Christian Church should be punishable with the penalty of deposition. It must be admitted, I think, that the language of the canon is obscure. Closely examined it seems to have been made up of two originally independent propositions, one of which was probably engrafted on the other as a rider or amendment; and in a council so stormy, it would be nothing wonderful if such an amendment were to be clumsily joined to the original proposition. This at all events is clear, that if the Council intended the very language of the Nicene Declaration to be universally obligatory, it does not say so; and it is equally

clear that if it intended to make the Nicene Declaration a test of all heresies, it adopted a formula which the Fathers of Constantinople had found to be insufficient to answer that purpose.

Twenty years later the work which was imperfectly done by the Council of Ephesus was unequivocally completed. In 451 the greatest of all the Councils, numbering 630 bishops, assembled at Chalcedon for the correction of recently invented forms of heresy ; and as the Council of Ephesus had found the Definition of Nicaea, fairly and grammatically construed in its obvious sense, was a sufficient protection against Nestorianism, so the Fathers of Chalcedon found that, in the definitions of Nicaea and Constantinople united, the Church had a sufficient protection against all heresies whatsoever. It was now 126 years since the Council of Nicaea had assembled and nearly 420 years since the Apostles had received their commission to go and teach all nations. In all that time the Catholic Church had never but twice, and then with great reluctance, exercised its supreme function of exact doctrinal definition. Heretics, on the contrary, had been ever ready with irreverent self-conceit to affirm or deny, as the whim took them ; and the absence of a fixed formula or symbol of faith had been severely felt. For want of it, faithful members of the Church had been liable to be led away by heretics who professed the greatest devotion to Orthodoxy and the utmost reverence for the Councils of the Church, but who availed themselves of the unrestrained liberty of exposition to set forth new formulas which were inconsistent with the faith of the Catholic Church.—The Declarations of Nicaea and Constantinople, were theologically exact in their terms ; they had been unequivocally approved by the Christian Churches throughout the whole world ; and they had been found to be amply sufficient in their scope to express the Catholic Faith. Therefore the Fathers of Chalcedon, in dealing with the new heresies of their day, imitated the example of the Fathers of Ephesus. They did not adopt or impose new definitions. They tested disputed doctrines by simply comparing them with the definitions of Nicaea and Constantinople. For the protection of the Church in the future they renewed the prohibition of Ephesus, which forbade the setting forth of any doctrinal statement which should be inconsistent with the definitions of Nicaea ; they extended that prohibition to statements inconsistent with the definitions of Constantinople ; and lastly they declared that not only the doctrines expressed in those definitions, but the very *ipsissima verba*, the identical words in which they were defined should be and remain unalterable. The distinction is very clearly brought out in the two words *pistis* and *symbolon* ; *pistis* referring to the doctrine, and *symbolon* to the formula of the Creed. Repeating the prohibition of Ephesus, the Father of Chalcedon declared “ that it is not lawful for any man to

produce, or compile, or compose, or hold, or teach to others any different faith (*heteran pistin*)," a prohibition which manifestly applied to the substance of the faith, and to all modes of teaching ; and then they proceeded furthermore to enact that " those who shall presume *either* to compose a different faith, *pistin*, or to publish or teach or deliver a different formula, *symbolon*," to persons desirous of turning to the truth from paganism, or Judaism, or any heresy whatsoever, shall be deposed, if they be bishops from the Episcopate, and clergymen from the Clergy ; and if they be monks or laymen, they shall be anathematised."—

3. *The Traditionalistic Plea Examined.*—The above arguments have been set forth to show that the later formula was the same as the earlier, only amplified.

It will be worth noting that in spite of all the arguments adduced, the historical fact that the two formularies are not the same, has not been touched. These arguments endeavour merely to show how possibly the development of Christian formularies from the first form to the second may have taken place.

Bishop Wordsworth's remarks may be criticised for two points :

(1). It is misleading to say that the Council of Constantinople agreed "without a dissentient voice, as far as we know"—to any determinations. The fact is that historians know absolutely nothing about the amount of unanimity of that Council in this or any other determinations. And unless Bishop Wordsworth has access to some source of evidence unknown to historians generally, it were wiser to state explicitly that nothing is known, for or against the unanimity of the council from first-hand sources.

(2). The Bishop is mistaken in stating that the Council reaffirmed the Nicene Creed in precisely the same words as those in which it was originally put forth. It can be shown that the changes amounted to more than 50 per cent. of the words, and that not only additions were made, but that important test-expressions were deliberately omitted, if it be true at all that the Nicene Creed was the base of the deliberations of the Constantinopolitan Fathers. The deliberate omissions, and changes of phraseology—apart from additions—prove that the assertion of Bishop Wordsworth that the Council confirmed "the faith of Nicaea in precisely the same words as those in which it was originally put forth in A. D. 325" is contrary to fact, and in matters so elementary that the simple reading of the two documents would have shielded him from committing so patent an error.

Dr. Bright is more careful than Bishop Wordsworth. He, at least, has read the authorities, even though his conclusions may be questioned.

If we arrange chronologically the facts he adduces it will be possible to gain a tolerably clear insight into their significance.

A. D. 325. Council at Nicaea adopts Nicene Creed as given by Sokratis.

347-348. Cyril, at Jerusalem, delivers lectures which contain expressions similar to the Epiphanian formulation.

367. Nicene Creed adopted by Council at Tyana in Cappadocia. Alteration : "And in one only-begotten God, the Lord Jesus Christ."

373. Epiphanius, in Cyprus, writes to a Church in Pamphilia his *Ancoratus*. It contains his Creed (Prayer-Book Nicene). He refers to it as "set forth by bishops more than 310 in number."

373. Basil writes to the Antiochene Church the Nicene Creed, omitting several words of it.

377. Basil writes to Epiphanius that "not the smallest addition" could be made to the Nicene Creed except on the subject of the Godhead of the Spirit. Declines to consider additions in respect to Incarnation.

381. Authority of Council of Constantinople (of "the 150") questioned in West, and in Egypt.

381-451. No mention anywhere of a creed of the Second Council.

431. Council of Ephesus. The Antiochene Party opposed to it recognize no creed other than the Nicene, although keenly opposed to "Apollinarizing" while the new Epiphanian, suppositiously of 381, Constantinople, directly opposes Appollinarianism in terms.

451. Council at Chalcedon. The Fathers do not question that the Epiphanian Creed was adopted by "the 150" in "the holy city." They adopt and recite two Creeds, of "the 318" and of "the 150." The latter with the original Nicene Creed forms a "wise and salutary symbol."

451. Sokratis says that the Council of Constantinople confirmed the Nicene Creed.

These are Dr. Bright's facts. Let us see what they omit. They omit any reference to contemporary witness that the Constantinopolitan Fathers either confirmed the Nicene Creed, or adopted the Epiphanian formulary as the Nicene Creed. The first notice of this is years later at Chalcedon. By that time a mistake may easily have become current.

Dr. Bright holds that it was "practically incredible that he (Eusebius) should not have known the wording of the Nicene Symbol." The best proof is that Eusebius did mis-state the wording of the Creed adopted by more than 310 Bishops. Eusebius may however have only meant that his formulation contained the doctrine of the Nicene Creed, without at the time vouching for the verbal accuracy.

It is impossible to understand what Dr. Bright means. Either Eusebius did set forth his formulation with belief it was the Nicene Creed, or he did not. If he did, he needs not that Dr. Bright should excuse his inaccuracy as failing to satisfy "modern" standards of "precision." In this case,

Eusebius is right, and his Creed is the actual Creed of Nicaea, and Sokratis, and Sozomen are fools or liars.

But if he did not set forth his formulation as the actual Creed of Nicaea, in all sincerity, then in saying it was, he knew he was deceiving. Then he needs Dr. Bright's excuses for lack of "modern" standards of precision. It may be remarked that this is not a matter of "precision," but a matter of morals, of righteousness, of honesty; and these standards remain the same in all ages. In this case, since it is "practically incredible that he should not have known the wording of the Nicene Symbol," and since he distinctly claims that his formulation was the Nicene Symbol, and since he must have known the truth, as Sokratis and Sozomen give it, then Epiphanius was consciously deceiving.

That is all; for facts are stronger than theories. Either Sokratis and Sozomen, or Eusebius are right. If Eusebius is right, his formulation is the Nicene Symbol, and it is exact; if he is wrong, his claim is false and it is not a question of precision, but of veracity or ignorance.

In another matter does Dr. Bright contradict himself grievously, in his own words.

(1). He says that the Creed of the "150 Fathers" was a recension of the Nicene Creed which practically superseded "the original form—a development of it—expanded in view of present doctrinal requirements, by means of material borrowed from the Creed of Jerusalem."

(2). He admits that the Council of Chalcedon adopted and recited two creeds, that of the "318" and of the "150." "It was quite possible in ancient times for persons to be zealously attached to the Nicene formulary, and yet to use side by side with it some other formulary agreeing with it in doctrine, but not altogether in language."

The consequence of these two statements is a dilemma.

Either the Creed of "the 150" is a development of, but the same as the creed of the "318," the Nicene Symbol, or it is a different creed.

It seems unnatural that in a Council two separate creeds should be recited, together with anathemas for any one who should alter even a letter of the first if the second is a development of the first, and has superseded it already, and is so much the same as the first as to permit the Church of to-day to call it the first.

If the second is a different creed from the first, then everything in the procedure of the Council is natural, and easily explained. But in that case Dr. Bright is mistaken when he urges that the second is a development of the first, and has superseded it. It is then an "other" formulary, not the same.

So Dr. Bright fails to show the continuity between the Epiphalian and the Nicene Creed.

Dr. Fulton is not happier than Dr. Bright.

In the first place, with the inimitable naïveté of apparent

ignorance that it had ever been doubted that the Council of Constantinople had adopted a recension of the Nicene Creed, he states that fact dogmatically over and over. "If the Fathers at Ephesus had intended to establish a Creed for universal use, they would hardly have forgotten the Declaration of Constantinople, whch would have perfectly answered that end.—It adopted a formula which the Fathers of Constantinople had been found to be insufficient to answer that purpose. In the definitions of Nicaea and Constantinople united the Church had a sufficient protection against all heresies soever. They tested disputed doctrines by simply comparing them with the definitions of Nicaea and Constantinople. They extended that prohibition to statements inconsistent with the definitions of Constantinople."

But Dr. Fulton's naïveté extends still further. He never mentions, as Dr. Bright does, that the authority of the Council of Constantinople was immediately and persistently questioned in the West and in Egypt. "The Declarations of Nicaea and Constantinople were theologically exact in their terms ; they had been unequivocally approved by the Christian Churches throughout the whole world." This is pretty severe on the whole West !

Besides his naïveté in respect to these important matters, Dr. Fulton is a greater theologian than Athanasius. "The Nicene Declaration would have been defective in several important particulars." And yet he himself insists strenuously that the Nicene Creed is a sufficient "eirenicon" for all Christians, and with approval quotes the words of the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon which anathematize anybody who should demand any more than the Nicene Creed of any new convert. Probably Dr. Fulton overlooked the fact that in making this statement he was anathematizing himself.

The oversight that the Council of Constantinople "brought down the Nicene Creed to its present form," with the exception of the Filioque, is asserted, among others, also by so scholarly a man as Robertson, in his *History of The Christian Church*, Vol. 1, p. 377.

4. *The Plea of Modern Research.*—The writer of these lines was first interested in the question under discussion by a note in Harnack's *Dogmengeschichte*, in which he considered Hort's work decisive in the matter. This led him directly to the words of Dr. Hort, and Dr. Gwatkin, on the subject.

(Henry Melvill Gwatkin, M. A. *Studies of Arianism*, Cambridge, Deighton Bell & Co, 1882, p 262). We surely need not condescend to discuss the story that the Council of Constantinople solemnly revised the Nicene Creed. Dr. Hort, *Two Dissertations*, has conclusively shown that the document in question is not a revision of the Nicene Creed at all, but of Cyril's Jerusalem formula, and that it cannot have had any sanction from the Council beyond an incidental approval when Cyril's case came before them. Bishop Wordsworth Ch. Hist. II, 332-

5, tells the old story all the better for his ignorance that it ever been disputed. He only alludes to recent doubts in a postscript. Recently it has found a more serious defender in Bright, *Canons of the First Four General Councils*, 80-82. But he lays unaccountable stress on the assertion of Aëtius at Chalcedon, makes no new point whatever, and seems not to have met with Dr. Hort's decisive work. At any rate he absolutely fails to touch its arguments. Nor is his own account of the matter free from serious objection. When he tells us that "this creed was in effect the Nicene confession expanded" he forgets that there is something more than expansion in it. Surely Athanasius would have had an anathema for the men who left out the all-important *ek tēs ousias*.

(Hort, *Two Dissertations*, p. 114.)

No unquestionable trace of the 'Constantinopolitan Creed' has yet, as far as I am aware, been found in the writings of theologians throughout this period. It is certainly unnoticed and unused in numerous places where the results of an ecumenical revision of the work of the 325 were not likely to be ignored. The contrast in the writings of John of Damascus is significant, p. 74. It is now certain that we have no evidence of any public recognition of the 'Constantinopolitan' Creed before the Council of Chalcedon in 457, when it was read by Aëtius a Deacon of Constantinople, as the 'Creed of the 150'—and accepted as orthodox, but not in any way placed on a level with the Nicene Creed, the Creed of the 318, which was likewise read, much less accepted, as taking its place.

p. 115. It was to all appearance reserved to a later time than the age of Chalcedon to confuse the Creed of the 150 with the enlarged Nicene Creed, and thus to complete the fictitious history which was begun when the 150 Fathers of Constantinople were first reputed to be the authors of the Creed of which we may well believe that they had expressed approval.

The short records of the Council of Constantinople illustrate indeed the watchfulness with which the sufficiency of the Nicene Creed was maintained; but threw no direct light on the foundation of the tradition which 70 years later associated the new form of Creed in some way with the 150 Bishops then assembled, and which does not seem likely to have been a mere invention. It is not however an unreasonable conjecture that the Creed was submitted to the Council by some one of its members and accepted as legitimate, without any idea of its becoming in any sense an ecumenical symbol, regulating the faith of many lands. However this may be, it was certainly in existence some years before the Council met, and already included those clauses which in a later age were specially said to have been introduced by the Council. (E. g. Note: 'Not only the additional clauses on the Holy Spirit, but *hou tēs basileias ouk estai telos*, which stands in the Creed of the Apostolic Constitutions as well as in that of Jerusalem.)

The responsibility for the 'Constantinopolitan Creed' is thus shifted from the Council of 381, in which various distinguished men took part, to an unknown, person, synod or church at an earlier date, possibly a much earlier date.

The 'Epiphanian' or 'Constantinopolitan Creed' is not a revised form of the Nicene at all, but of the Creed of Jerusalem.

Written by Cyril 362, on return to his diocese, now as orthodox, inserting Conciliar (p. 96.) language into his own Semiarrian symbol (p. 99. Note 1). The ratification of the Nicene Creed was thus the act which defined the doctrinal position of the Council both positively and negatively. It is difficult to see how on such an occasion an enlargement of the Creed as a standard of conversion could have been carried out without suicidal inconsistency.

p. 107. The Epiphanian Creed has 33 out of 178 words of the true creed of Nicaea: Note: that is, less than a fifth of the whole. This reckoning of course excludes words found in both the Nicene and the Jerusalem Creeds, but proved by the preceding comparison not to have been in fact derived from the Nicene Creed.

p 111. Subsequent to its early transcription by Epiphanius the creed that becomes visible 70 years after the Council of Constantinople. Apparently it then relapses into total obscurity for 85 years more: and 172 years have passed since the Council so far as can be gathered from my clear evidence yet advanced before it is found identified with the Nicene Creed, that is, treated as an improved revision of it.

p 115. It was to all appearance reserved for a later time than the age of Chalcedon to confuse the "Creed of the 150" with the enlarged Nicene Creed, and thus to complete the fictitious history which was begun when 150 Fathers of Constantinople were first reputed to be authors of the Creed of which we may well believe that they had expressed approval.

5. *The Conciliar Documents.*—In order to judge of the question independently, it may be interesting to notice the actual words of the Conciliar decrees, as Mansi has given them.

The following are extracts from the report of the Council of Constantinople, 318 A. D.

Letter of the Synod to the Emperor Theodosius the Great.

Then we pronounced some concise definitions ratifying the Faith of the Nicene Fathers, and anathematising the heresies which have sprung up contrary thereto.

Cannon I. The Faith of the 318 Fathers assembled at Nicaea in Bythynia shall not be set aside, but shall stand fast.

The reader will of course ask, Do the records of Council contain the Epiphanian Creed? Yes: Mansi gives it: but in a small parenthesis adds: "As contained in the acts of the Council of Chalcedon." So it becomes plain that some one, out of the officiousness of a compiler, gave ground for the universal misconception on the subject. Yet Mansi had the honesty

to add the source from which he derived it ; and it is in the last resort the opinion of the Chalcedonian Fathers which is responsible for the trouble.

The Fathers of Constantinople confine themselves to reaffirming the Nicene Council which they could hardly do honestly if they were just about to supersede it by a later recension, or development of it. In another version of the same canons, Mansi, Hist. Counc. Vol. III, p. 577, it is said : "Change not the faith, nor transgress its statutes : namely the statutes of the Holy Fathers who congregated at Nicaea ; but let them remain whole, just as they were given forth."

The following are Canons of the Council of Ephesus, A. D. 431.

Canon VII.—These things having been read, the Holy Synod decrees that it is unlawful for any man to bring forward or to write or to compose any other Creed than that established by the holy and blessed Fathers assembled, with the Holy Ghost in Nicaea.

But those who shall dare to compose another Creed, or to Heathenism or Judaism, or from any heresy whatsoever, shall be deposed of they be Bishops or Clergymen ; Bishops from the Episcopate and Clergymen from the Clergy ; and if they be laymen they should be anathematised.

And in like manner, if any, whether Bishops, Clergymen or laymen, should be discovered to hold or teach the doctrines contained in the exposition produced by the Presbyter Chrysostom concerning the Incarnation of the only-begotten Son of God, on the abominable and profane doctrines of Nestorius which have been condemned ; they shall be subjected to the sentence of this Holy and Ecumenical Council.—

Preface to Canon VII.—

' The Decree of the same Holy Synod, pronounced after hearing the exposition (of the Faith) by the 318 holy and blessed Fathers in the City of Nicaea, and the impious Creed composed by Theodore of Mopsuestia and given to the same Holy Synod at Ephesus by the Presbyter Chrysostom of Philadelphia.'

Here follow Canons of the Council of Chalcedon, A. D. 451.

The Definition of Faith agreed upon at the Council of Chalcedon.—

And this we have done with one unanimous consent, driving away envious doctrines and renewing the missing faith of the Fathers, publishing to all men the creed of the 318, and to their numbers adding as their peers, the Fathers who have received the same summary of religion. Such are the 150 Fathers who afterwards assembled in the great City of Constantinople and ratified the same Faith. Moreover observing the order and every form relating to the Faith which was observed by the Holy Synod formerly held in Ephesus, of which Celestine of Rome and Cyril of Alexandria, of holy memory, were the leaders, we do declare that the exposition of the

right and blessed Faith made by the 318 holy and blessed Fathers assembled at Nicaea in the reign of Constantine of pious memory shall be preëminent: and that those things shall be of force also, which were decreed by the 150 holy Fathers at Constantinople, for the uprooting of the heresies which had then sprung up, and for the confirmation of the same one Catholic and Apostolic Faith.

'This wise and saving Creed of the divine grace sufficed. This present holy and great oecumenical Council . . . has at the very outset decreed that the Creed of the 318 Fathers shall not be tampered with. And on account of them that contend against the Holy Ghost, it confirms the doctrine afterwards delivered concerning the substance of the Spirit by the 150 holy Fathers who assembled in the holy City.'

From consideration of the above it will appear that all three Councils agree on insisting on the Nicene Creed as an unchangeable witness of faith, than which no more shall be demanded from converts, on pain of deposition, and anathematization.

It is equally clear that the Council of Chalcedon recited along with the Nicene Creed, another Creed, the Epiphanian. Nowhere is it stated to be the Nicene Creed; if it were, it would not be referred to and recited beside the other. On the contrary, it is only said it was originated by the holy 150 Fathers at Constantinople, an excusable anachronism. There is in this no excuse to call it a "Creed commonly called the Nicene," or "The Nicene Creed."

6. *Hort's Proof.*—It is not sufficient to prove merely that the Epiphanian Creed is not the Nicene Creed. It is desirable to know actually whence it came.

Dr. Hort's work, which Harnack and Gwatkin think decisive, leads the enquirer to the Creed of Jerusalem, which Cyril amplified with orthodox phrases, when he returned from exile to his home. Before he went into exile, although he had been considered one of the orthodox party, his Creed was Semi-arian, and when he returned he felt it incumbent upon him to correct this defect.

Dr. Hort proves his point by giving all the Creeds in full, and by showing that if the Epiphanian Creed was derived from the Nicene, the additions would be many, the changes of many expressions still more, and several expressions would be omitted. On the contrary, if the Epiphanian Creed was an amplification of the Jerusalem Creed, the only changes would be the consistent addition of whole clauses, not separate unimportant words, here and there.

The omissions would be the important Athanasian (1) "that is, from the being of the Father;" (2) God of God, (3) only-begotten. Besides, the "Epiphanian Creed has only 33 out of 178 words of the true Creed of Nicaea, note, that is, less than a fifth of the whole. This reckoning of course excludes words found in both the Nicene and Jerusalem Creeds, but proved

by the preceding comparison not to have been in fact derived from the Nicene Creed."

I. Cesarean Creed.

We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, he who is the Maker of all things visible and invisible.

And in one Lord Jesus Christ,—the Logos of THE God,—God, of God,—Light of Light,—Life of Life,—the only-begotten Son,—the First-born of every Creature,—Being born of the Father before all ages—through whom all things arose.—Who being incarnate for our salvation,—and dwelling among men—and suffering,—and rising on the third day,—and ascending to the Father,—and sitting again in glory to judge the living and the dead.

(And we believe) And in the Holy Ghost.

II. The Nicene Creed, exhibited with the Creed of Caesarea as its base.

(The original words of the Cesarean Creed are in capitals ; words which, in Greek, are in the Cesarean, but not the Nicene Creed, are omitted. These can be seen by comparison with the Creed above.)

WE BELIEVE IN ONE GOD, THE FATHER ALMIGHTY, THE MAKER OF ALL THINGS VISIBLE AND INVISIBLE.

AND IN ONE LORD JESUS CHRIST,—THE SON OF THE GOD,—begotten only-begotten of the Father,—that is, from the Being of the Father,—GOD OF GOD,—LIGHT OF LIGHT,—Very God of very God,—Begotten, not Made ;—Consubstantial with the Father,—THROUGH WHOM ALL THINGS AROSE, both those in heaven and in the earth (on the earth),—Who for the sake of us who are men, AND FOR OUR SALVATION came down and WAS INCARNATE,—BECOMING MAN, SUFFERING, AND RISING ON THE THIRD DAY,—ASCENDING into heaven, (the Heavens),—Who shall come TO JUDGE THE QUICK AND THE DEAD.

AND IN the Holy GHOST.

But those who say of the Son of THE God, There was not a time when he was not, or, He was not before he was begotten, and that He was made out of things not existing, or, who say that He is of an other Substance and Being, (or created), or Variable, or changeable, (these) the catholic (and apostolic) Church anathematizes.

III. The "Constantinopolitan" Creed, or Revised Creed of Jerusalem, with the Nicene Creed as its assumed base.

(Nicene Creed in capitals.)

WE BELIEVE IN ONE GOD THE FATHER ALMIGHTY,—Maker of heaven and earth,—AND OF all THINGS VISIBLE AND INVISIBLE :—

AND IN ONE LORD JESUS CHRIST,—THE only-begotten SON OF THE GOD ;—He who is begotten of his Father before all worlds,—LIGHT OF LIGHT,—VERY GOD OF VERY GOD,—CONSUBSTANTIAL WITH THE FATHER ; BY WHOM ALL THINGS AROSE. WHO FOR US WHO ARE

MEN AND FOR OUR SALVATION DESCENDED from the heavens,—AND WAS INCARNATE of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary,—And WAS MADE MAN :—And was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate ;—He suffered and was buried :—AND THE THIRD DAY HE ROSE AGAIN according to the Scriptures :—And ASCENDED INTO THE HEAVENS,—And sitteth on the right hand of the Father,—And he SHALL COME AGAIN with glory TO JUDGE BOTH THE QUICK AND THE DEAD ;—Whose kingdom shall have no end.

AND IN THE HOLY GHOST, The Lord, and Giver of Life,—Who proceedeth from the Father,—Who with the Father and Son together is worshipped and glorified ;—Who spake by the Prophets.

In one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church :—We acknowledge one Baptism for the remission of sins,—And we look for the Resurrection of the Dead :—And the life of the coming Age. Amen.

IV. The Earlier Creed of Jerusalem.

We believe in one God, the Father Almighty,—Maker of heaven and earth,—and of all things visible, and invisible.

And in one Lord Jesus Christ,—the only-begotten Son of THE God,—being born very God from the Father before all the Ages, Through whom all things arose.—He was incarnate and made Man,—crucified and buried,—He arose on the third day,—and ascended into the heavens,—and sat down at the right hand of the Father,—He shall come again in glory to judge the quick and the dead, of whose kingdom there shall be no end.

And in one Holy Ghost,—The Comforter,—Who spake by the Prophets.

And in one Baptism of repentance for the remission of sins,—And in one Holy Catholic Church,—And in the resurrection of the Flesh,—and in the Life everlasting.

V. The Constantinopolitan Creed or Revised Creed of Jerusalem, Exhibited with the Earlier Creed of Jerusalem as its base.

(Capitals, Earlier Creed of Jerusalem ; Italics, Nicene Insertions.)

WE BELIEVE IN ONE GOD THE FATHER ALMIGHTY,—MAKER OF HEAVEN AND EARTH,—AND OF THINGS VISIBLE AND *invisible* :—

AND IN ONE LORD JESUS CHRIST,—THE ONLY-BEGOTTEN SON OF *the* GOD ;—HE WHO WAS BEGOTTEN OF HIS FATHER BEFORE ALL AGES,—*Light of Light*,—*Very God of very God*,—*Begotten, not made*,—*Consubstantial with the Father* ; BY WHOM ALL THINGS AROSE. Who for us who are men and for our salvation descended from the heavens,—and WAS INCARNATE of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary,—AND WAS MADE MAN ;—And WAS CRUCIFIED also for us under Pontius Pilate :—He suffered AND WAS BURIED ;—And THE THIRD DAY HE ROSE AGAIN, ac-

cording to the Scriptures ;—AND ASCENDED INTO THE HEAVENS,— AND sitteth ON THE RIGHT HAND OF THE FATHER,—AND HE SHALL COME again WITH GLORY. TO JUDGE BOTH THE QUICK AND THE DEAD;—WHOSE KINGDOM SHALL HAVE NO END.

AND IN the holy GHOST, The Lord, and Giver of Life, —Who proceedeth from the Father,—Who with the Father and Son together is worshipped and glorified ;—WHO SPAKE by the PROPHETS.

IN ONE HOLY CATHOLIC and Apostolic CHURCH;—We acknowledge one Baptism for the remission of sins,—And we look for the RESURRECTION of the Dead ;—AND THE LIFE of the coming age. Amen.

VI. The Interpolated Nicene Creed as recited in the definition of Chalcedon, Exhibited with the Interpotations distinguished from the Original Creed.

(Interpotations in Capitals.)

We believe in one God the Father Almighty,—the Maker of all things visible and invisible.

And in One Lord Jesus Christ,—the Son of THE God,—HE WHO was born only-begotten of the Father,—God of God,—Light of Light,—Very God of very God,—Begotten, not made,—Consubstantial with the Father,—Through whom all things arose. Who for us men and for our salvation came down FROM THE HEAVENS, and was incarnate OF THE HOLY GHOST AND THE VIRGIN MARY,—And was made man ;—HE WAS CRUCIFIED FOR US UNDER PONTIUS PILATE, AND suffered, AND WAS BURIED ;—And he rose again on the third day ACCORDING TO THE SCRIPTURES,—And ascended into the heavens,—AND SITTETH AT THE RIGHT HAND OF THE FATHER,—And shall come again WITH GLORY to judge both the quick and the dead,—WHOSE KINGDOM SHALL HAVE NO END.

And in THE HOLY Ghost, THE LORD AND GIVER OF LIFE.

But those who say, of the Son of THE God, There was a time when he was not, or, He was not before he was begotten, and that He was made out of things not existing, or, who say that He is of an other Substance and Being, or Variable, or Changeable, these the Catholic and Apostolic Church anathematizes.

7. *Theological Significance of the Changes.*—The difference between the Nicene and the Epiphanian Creeds has been pointed out above ; it remains to consider its theological significance. The difference is as follows.

(1). “And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God,” for : “And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of the God, born only-begotten of the Father, that is, from the being of the Father.”

The important additions are as follows.

(2). “Begotten of his Father before all worlds.”

(3). "By the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary."
(4). "And was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate."
(5). "And was buried."
(6). "According to the Scriptures."
(7). "And sitteth on the right hand of God."
(8). "With glory."
(9). "Whose kingdom shall have no end."
(10). "The Lord, and Giver of Life, Who proceedeth from the Father and the Son ; Who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified ; Who spake by the Prophets : And I believe one Catholic and Apostolic Church ; I acknowledge one Baptism for the remission of sins : and I look for the Resurrection of the Dead, and the Life of the world to come. Amen."

A sharp distinction should be drawn between the essentials, and the non-essentials of the Faith. It matters but little in how many non-essentials two men may differ; as long as they agree in respect to the essentials, they are both entitled to orthodoxy as designation of their ecclesiastical status. Now a Creed is a statement of the essentials of Faith ; what it omits is one of the non-essentials, on the subject of which two orthodox Christians have full liberty to differ.

When it is pointed out, therefore, what a Creed does not contain, it is not meant to assert that such doctrine was not believed or preached by orthodox Christians ; far from that. But it does mean that such a doctrine was by the framers of that Creed considered a non-essential, which men might hold or not as they pleased. The very fact that the framers of a Creed held some doctrine which they did not insert into it is sufficient proof that they considered that it belonged to the non-essentials of Christianity, that it was possible that a man should be a Christian while withholding his assent from them.

The Bible, without a doubt, contains many facts and doctrines which the Creed does not mention ; they are none the less true, and worthy of belief for that. But the Creed chooses from among them those vital facts which constitute the Christian interpretation of all that the Bible teaches. And therefore, nothing more than the Creed should be demanded of any Christian.

Not only is this reason, but it is Canon Law. The Ephesine and Chalcedonian Councils go as far as to decree anathematization and deposition from the ministry not only against those who should presume to alter even a letter of the Nicene Creed, but who should, in receiving a convert or member of the Church of some other Diocese, demand even a word more of doctrine than the Creed itself sets forth. This could hardly have been the case if they, the framers of these canons, had not considered that anything outside of the Creed of Nicaea was more than a non-essential of theology.

With these principles in mind, and remembering that to

prove a thing a non-essential has not the slightest reference to the question whether or not earlier Fathers held some particular belief, it will be worth while to make the logical deduction from the differences between the Nicene and the Epiphanian Symbols.

Any man has the canonical right to be called an orthodox Christian, without a belief

(1). That Jesus was only-begotten, except inasmuch as it means that he was born of the very being and nature of the Father ;

(2). That Jesus was begotten before all worlds ;

(3). That Jesus was born " by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary ; "

(4). That he sat down at the right hand of God ;

(5). That the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Fathers and the Son, that with the Father and the Son he is worshipped and glorified ; that he spake by the Prophets ;

(6). In one Catholic and Apostolic Church ; in Baptism for the remission of sins, in the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come.

On the contrary : the essentials of Chalcedonian orthodoxy are :

" We believe in one God, the Father almighty, the Maker of all things visible and invisible ;

And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of the God ; born only-begotten of the Father, that is, from the being of the Father ; God of God, very God of very God ; born, not made, consubstantial with the Fathers, through whom all things in heaven and earth arose ; for us men and for our salvation he descended, and was incarnated, and became man ; he suffered and rose on the third day, he ascended into heaven, and will come to judge the quick and the dead.

And I believe in the Holy Ghost."

Agreeing on these broad lines of the only Nicene Creed in existence, and permitting full latitude on all points not covered by this Creed, the scattered flock of God may reunite some day, if only none will arise who will seek to increase the differences between different men in regard to all non-essentials. May this long-prayed for event come soon !

THE LAMBETH ARTICLES.

1. *Position of the Laity.*—There are, within the pale of Christianity, many conscientious laymen who, more or less, have become aware of the difficulties of dogmas. To each of them the question presents itself whether they can conscientiously remain where they are. The decision must be determined mainly by the particular circumstances of the case.

If they happen to be in Churches where the crude and repulsive notions of extreme dogmatism are preached, as required by Methodist vicarious salvation, or Presbyterian infant damnation, prudence would dictate putting an end to continual unpleasant thoughts, as suggested by preacher or service.

As a rule, however, even among the bodies mentioned above, there would be no necessity of severing connection with those organizations. The clergy as a rule have been led to insist less and less on the distinctive features of the doctrines they are commissioned to preach; and that for the very practical reason that they do not care to preach to empty benches. All the Churches have become more or less liberalized, and without realizing it, and most of the clergy are as unorthodox as their congregations or more so.

It is always the part of wisdom to remain in the place in which the Providence of God has placed us, until circumstances show duty to go elsewhere. Besides, it is not the highest form of work for the truth to destroy, and deny. Negative work is, at best, incomplete, and fraught with danger to weak consciences. Much more divine is the constructive work which proceeds regularly and perfectly, feeding the souls of the weak, until they become strong enough to seek the light for themselves. Besides, there is no divine command to judge of others. If we do set forth the truth, we do all that is required of us.

In any case, however, change of association with religious bodies is easy enough for laymen, and can take place without unpleasant stirring up of animosity, and uncharitableness. And perhaps the wisest position for the layman is the scientific attitude of doubt, which is, seeking the truth everywhere, and ready to receive it from any source, without, in the meanwhile, attaching themselves formally to any body.

2. *Position of the Clergy.*—The position of the clergy, however, is much more difficult than that of the laity. The layman is not expected or forced to believe anything but a minimum of doctrine. The clergyman, however, before he can enter his life-work, must solemnly declare his unfeigned assent to the whole of the doctrine of the body with which he is connected.

Whether it would be possible for a Christian determined to assert freedom of thought to remain in the Christian body in which he is at home, depends entirely on the conditions of subscription which prevail in that body. In some the conditions are stricter, in some laxer.

3. *The Lambeth Articles as test of Orthodoxy.*—Before it is possible to acknowledge assent or dissent from the doctrines of the Church, it is necessary to define these. In July, 1888, a “Conference of Bishops of the Anglican Communion,” holden at Lambeth Palace, in England, proposed the following articles as a basis of Church union with other bodies.

(a). The Holy Scriptures, of the Old and New Testaments, as “containing all things necessary to salvation,” and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith.

(b). The Apostles’ Creed, as the Baptismal Symbol ; and the Nicene Creed as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith.

(c). The two Sacraments ordained by Christ himself—baptism and the supper of the Lord—ministered with unfailing use of Christ’s words of institution, and of the elements ordained by him.

(d). The Historic Episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the Unity of his Church.

It is evident that if the Anglican Church defined these four articles as a sufficient statement of doctrine, that we may consider her doctrine to be these four articles. Besides, these four articles should be interpreted not in a preconceived traditional sense, but on its merits. What is the use of a definition if this formulation stands in need of a further definition ? That is, if it is to be interpreted in one sense alone ? When learned men deliberately set forth a definition in the sight of the whole world, it must be supposed that they mean just what they say, neither more nor less.

In view of these facts, it is worth while to examine these four articles narrowly, in order to ascertain whether the conscientious Christian can accept them, and therefore retain his place within the body in which he may chance to be.

4. *The Holy Scriptures.*—The first article reads as follows : “The Holy Scriptures, of the Old and New Testaments, as containing all things necessary to salvation, and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith.”

This proposition contains the following assertions.

(1). The Holy Scriptures mean the books of the Bible held to be of canonical authority within the Anglican communion. This excludes the books commonly called Apocryphal.

(2). These books contain all things necessary to salvation.

(3). They are the rule, and ultimate standard of faith.

More interesting than what this proposition contains, is that which it omits.

(1). It omits all mention of the doctrine of inspiration, or of any particular theory of inspiration.

(2). It omits a proviso such as we find in the Profession of faith of Pius IV, in which the Scriptures must be interpreted only in the sense which the Church directs.

(3). It omits all condemnation of critical and rational study of the origin, growth, and nature of the books of the Bible.

Few if any will object to the assertions implied in this article.

No one who has read the Apocrypha of the Old Testament with any impartiality will hesitate to pronounce them hardly equal to the canonical books in point of depth, morality, style, and probability.

No one will object to the statement that they contain all things necessary to salvation. Their choice of subjects is so varied, their spiritual insights so deep, their lovely simplicity so affecting, that in comparison with the other Bibles of the world, the Jewish Scriptures by universal consent are ranked first; and to be the first of the best and wisest books of the world insures the fact that it contains the most of what is known to be necessary to salvation, and therefore to contain all things necessary to a salvation according to their standard; which is by common consent the highest standard yet known.

The next assertion of this article is the truth complementary to this. They are the rule and ultimate standard of faith. The best book of the world should certainly be yielded the preëminence in the matter of authority, and of furnishing a standard of belief. No man has the right to deny such authority to the wisest and most lovely thoughts the world has known. No other standard than this should be permitted; not a General Council, run by the majority or an unbaptised Constantine; not the pope or the bishop; not the writings of well-meaning men who were looked up to in the ages of ignorance that succeeded the sub-apostolic Church. If we are to seek anywhere for an authority, here it will be found, and we will have no rest in our search for one until we accept it, the best book of the world.

We must now turn to some points which it omits.

That the Bible is inspired, no one will doubt. There is no good in us which is not of the influence of God. Should not then the best that we have be of him? All good books are inspired, inasmuch as they are good; the best that we have must be most inspired.

Yet, although we may yield unfeigned assent to this opinion, is important to remark that it says nothing of the manner in which it is inspired, of the psychological theory of the influence of the divine spirit on the human spirit by which the inspired record is produced.

It says nothing of inerrancy, in word and letter, nor does it make claims exclusively for itself. It tells its story simply, naïvely, plainly. It is not hard to find contradictions, inconsistencies, improbabilities; but the very fact that these exist shows the entire good faith of the writers, whoever they were. They spoke to the best of their ability, nor did they endeavor to arrange their statements so that they might attain some ulterior purpose. This very sincerity is proof of its inspiration.

In the second place, the first Lambeth article lays down no rule of interpretation. Reason and common-sense, with

scientific determination of what a writer living in those days would be likely to mean must be the guide. This excludes the straining of texts to favour some theory, orthodox or heretical.

In the third place, it is important to remember that the articles do not exclude rational, scientific criticism such as would be applied to any other book. In calling the Bible the rule and ultimate standard of faith, the enquirer does not accept any theory as to who wrote the Pentateuch or the Gospels. He accepts the Bible for exactly what it is worth ; and scientific criticism will tell him just what is its real value. Calm critical reflection will judge of the date of a book, and thereby decide of the meaning and importance of its expressions. There is therefore no reason why any should be afraid to accept the Scriptures as the rule and ultimate standard of faith ; for reason will decide first what this rule and standard of faith actually is.

5. *The Creeds.*—The second Lambeth article reads as follows : "The Apostles' creed, as the baptismal symbol ; and the Nicene creed as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith."

The first question occurs immediately, what are these creeds ?

The Apostles' Creed in the form we have it is found for the first time in the works of Pirmenianus in 750 A. D. The Nicene Creed was adopted by the Council of Nicaea, in the year 325 A. D. On account of its priority, it is wise to begin with a consideration of the Nicene Symbol.

The Nicene definition reads as follows :

"We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, the Maker of all things visible and invisible ;

"And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of the God ; born only-begotten of the Father, that is, from the being of the Father ; God of God, light of light, very God of very God ; born not made, consubstantial with the Father, through whom all things in Heaven and earth arose ; for us men and for our salvation he descended, and was incarnated, and became man ; he suffered and rose on the third day, he ascended into Heaven, and will come to judge the quick and the dead.

"And I believe in the Holy Ghost."

But the Nicene Creed as given by the Church has the following important alteration, besides some additions :

(1). "And in our Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God," for : "And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the son of the God, born only-begotten of the Father, that is, from the being of the Father."

This change is significant. It omits the important definition of what is meant by being only-begotten, and also the Philonic distinction of "THE" God, as applied to the Father.

The omission of the definition of what is meant by "only-begotten" is so much the more important, as without it the famous expression is misleading. Standing by itself it seems

to infer that there can be only one only-begotten Son, whereas when the explanation is given, it is plain that there can be an infinity of Sons begotten from the being of the Father. Theologically the omission amounts almost to a misstatement.

The additions are as follows :

(2). "Begotten of his Father before all worlds." This addition makes a great distinction between the Son of God and the rest of creation, inasmuch as he preceded everything else. The Nicene Creed does not so much as hint this radical distinction.

(3). "By the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary." These are the words which are the only foundation of the doctrine of the Virgin birth ; and it is significant that they do not appear until the Council of Chalcedon, A. D. 451, 126 years after the Council of Nicaea. The Virgin Birth may have been held by the Bishops of Nicaea, but it does not appear in the Creed, so that the burden of proof lies on those who assert that they held it and believed it.

(4). "And was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate."

(5). "And was buried."

(6). "According to the Scriptures."

(7). "And sitteth on the right hand of God." Thus the doctrines of the divine Session is also a novelty of the Council of Chalcedon.

(8). "With glory."

(9). "Whose kingdom shall have no end."

(10). "The Lord, and Giver of Life, Who proceeded from the Father and Son ; Who with the Father and Son together is worshipped and glorified ; Who spake by the Prophets : And I believe one Catholic and Apostolic Church ; I acknowledge one Baptism for the remission of sins : and I look for the Resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come. Amen." This is a very material and bulky addition to the Nicene Creed, full of weighty doctrines, and a startling innovation.

These ten changes and additions evidently alter the very marrow of the faith. Yet the Lambeth article declares that the Nicene Creed is a sufficient statement of the Christian Faith. Consequently these additions are not necessary beliefs of the Christian. A man may therefore be a Christian without declaring in his statement of belief that he holds.

(1). that Jesus was only-begotten, except inasmuch as it means that he was born of the very being and nature of the Father.

(2). that Jesus was begotten before all worlds.

(3). that Jesus was born "by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary." This includes the doctrine of the Virgin birth.

(4). that he sat down at the right hand of God.

(5). that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son, that with the Father and the Son he is worshipped and glorified ; that he spake by the prophets ;

(6). in one Catholic and Apostolic Church ; in Baptism

for the remission of sins, in the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come.

Those who believe in the Scriptures will believe exactly what is written there, since they are the rule and ultimate standard of faith ; but, since the Nicene Creed is a sufficient statement of the Christian faith, no more than this should be demanded from a man when he gives a statement of his belief. Doubtless many will find these omitted doctrines in the Bible, so that they are not lost beliefs to him who accepts the Scriptures as the rule and ultimate standard of faith. Yet, according to the Lambeth articles, they must not be required in a confession of belief, or in a definition of what forms Christian belief.

It is time to turn to the Apostles' Creed, as the Baptismal Symbol. This infers that before a neophyte can be baptized he must profess to believe this Creed. The question occurs immediately, What is it ?

The form in which the Church uses it is first found in the writings of Pirminianus, A. D. 750. This is 375 years after the Council of Nicaea, whose Creed was by the Lambeth Article declared to be a sufficient statement of the Christian faith. If it be really a sufficient statement, we are not bound to accept any formulation later than that ; and if we are to believe the Apostles' Creed, we must by that mean a form of it prior to 325 A. D., not one found for the first time 375 years after that event. It will be necessary therefore to consider that form which was found last before the Council of Nicaea ; and it will be instructive to see the one next after the Council. J. Rawson Lumby, in his History of the Creed, gives the former form as that of Novatian, 260 A. D., and the latter as that of Marcellus, 341 A. D.

The Creed of Novatian runs as follows :

"I believe in God the Father ; In Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the Lord our God ; and in the Holy Spirit."

The Creed of Cyprian, 250 A. D., ten years older than this one, reads as follows :

"I believe in God the Father ; In Christ his Son ; In the Holy Ghost within the Holy Church, the Remission of sins, and eternal Life."

These creeds are of startling simplicity when compared with any Post-Nicene formulation, as, for instance, that of Marcellus, 341 A. D. :

"I believe in God Almighty ; in Jesus Christ his only-begotten Son, our Lord ; being born of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary, crucified under Pontius Pilate, and buried ; he rose on the third day from the dead : ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of the Father, whence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead. And in the Holy Ghost, the Holy Church, the Remission of Sins, the Resurrection of the flesh, and the Life eternal."

This form has the following additions to the Nicene Creed, and to that of Cyprian and Marcellus :

(1). Being born of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary.

(2). Crucified under Pontius Pilate, and was buried.
(3). And sitteth at the right hand of the Father.
(4). The Holy Church, the Remission of Sins, the Resurrection of the Flesh, and the Life Eternal.

Looking back to the additions to the Nicene Creed found in the Creed "of the 150," the strange fact appears, that almost the same additions to the creed of Cyprian are found in that of Marcellus, which are found added to the Nicene Symbol by the "Creed of the 150." There can only be one conclusion: that shortly after the Council of Nicaea, perhaps sixteen years after it, the doctrines of the Virgin Birth, of the Crucifixion, of the Session, and of the addition to the last clause, were deliberately added to the Creed. This does not mean that these doctrines had not been held before, or that they had not been found in the Gospels before; but only now were they added to the Christian statement of faith. If however, the Nicene Creed is a sufficient statement of the Christian faith, then it becomes evident that these later additions to both the Nicene and Apostolic formulations must be omitted from what we consider necessary parts of the Christian statement of faith, not denying that they may be found in the Gospels. They are not then essentials; on the contrary they are superfluous additions, immaterial to a statement of Christian belief.

When, however, the Lambeth Article declares the Nicene Creed a sufficient statement of the Christian faith, and then adds that the Apostles' Creed is sufficient as a baptismal symbol, then we must suppose the baptismal symbol is simpler than a "sufficient statement of the Christian faith;" and that it must mean some form of the Apostles' Creed anterior to the Nicene formulation, and free from the additions which were made to both in later times.

The Baptismal symbol must therefore be a form of the Apostles' Creed anterior to 325, that is, Cyprian's, in the year 250 A. D. But in this Jesus of Nazara is not even identified by explicit mention with the Messiah of God. The Remission of sins is not explicitly limited to a vicarious sacrifice; and the Life eternal is the common hope of mankind.

The Lambeth article is therefore sufficiently liberal to permit a Christian, without straining of his conscience, to claim and assert his right to a position within the Church which adopted the Lambeth Articles.

6. *The Sacraments.*—The third Lambeth article reads as follows: "The two Sacraments ordained by Christ himself—Baptism and Supper of the Lord—ministered with unfailing use of Christ's words of institution, and of the elements ordained by him."

The Sacrament of Baptism is a rite so beautifully appropriate to that which it signifies, the dedication of the life to the service of God, that that it is inconceivable how any should object to it. It was in use long before the time of Jesus, and deserves to remain in use as long as men dedicate their being to the service of God. The formula, In the name

of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, is a most poetic formulation of dedication of the organism to all the laws of the Universe in its great realms of transcending divinity, common humanity, and the divine influences which are alway seeking to guide and elevate seekers after God.

The Supper of the Lord is a like beautiful rite. Who would not commemorate the saintly life and unique example of the Master of Nazara, by eating bread and drinking wine, "in remembrance" of him? Humbler and more reverent must he grow who assembles together with his brethren to commemorate the divine mission of the great Christ, Jesus of Nazara. Word for word may be the formula of institution be used; and he who does so with childlike simplicity will receive the fulness of the blessing that always blesses him who seeks the heights of his life on the heights of the life of the world.

7. *The Ministry.*—The fourth and last Lambeth article declares belief in "the Historic Episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the unity of his Church."

The "Historic Episcopate," as the name implies, is a matter of history. It is therefore not a matter of discussion, and speculation. Whatever history, unbiased, and sincere, will declare, that must the world accept. There is no use, therefore, of declaring as the Anglican Ordinal does that "it is evident unto all men, diligently reading holy Scriptures and ancient authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these orders of ministers in Christ's Church,—Bishops, Priests and Deacons." A matter of history cannot be the subject of dogmatic assent and belief.

Apart then from the witness of history, which must be left to future generations to work out, it is very evident that if there is any organized body there must be some authority at the head to direct and guide. There is an absolute need of overseers, "bishops," of some kind or another. If the Church insists on such a matter as ordination by tactful succession through a definite line of bishops, well and good. It can do no harm, and if it is any comfort to the Church to feel that the overseers are chosen and ordained in this manner, surely no one would have the bad taste to object. Wisely, however, does the Lambeth article direct that it shall be locally adapted to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called by God into the unity of his Church. To the Church that desires it, let ordination be granted; to other bodies who seek God as Christians, let the succession of overseers, theoretical or practical be permitted in the natural course of events. There will always, by virtue of the law of the survival of the fittest, remain a leader of some kind in an organized body; so the historic episcopate—for every event is historic, and every overseer is episcopal—will never fail to the end of the world. With this hope in their hearts the Christians need not fear for the future, but may with full confidence leave it in the hands of God.